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ABSTRACT

Existing literature suggests that father nurturance is important in the socioemotional development of children. However, although studies have collectively suggested a number of factors as being correlated with father nurturance, it remains unclear what the specific determinants are. The purpose of the current study was to assess the relative influence of fathers' personality attributes, early child care experience, and other sociocultural factors in predicting a father's level of nurturance towards his children. Sixty-five, 24- to 52-year old, middle- to upper-middle class, married fathers from dual-career families completed a 131-item questionnaire assessing a father's background, personality, early relationship with his own father, support network, marriage, employment, and level of nurturance. The results showed that a father's description of his experience in fatherhood and the degree of importance he attributes to his role in fathering, the play-oriented component of his personality, and the quantity of support he receives in fathering are significant predictors of his current level of nurturance.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, a growing number of studies on contemporary fatherhood have focused on the father's role in the nurturing of his children (e.g., Carlson, 1984; Cronenwett, 1982; Lamb, 1986; Robinson & Barret, 1986). Lamb (1976) stated that much of the research on father "nurturance" was too vague and subjective to be of predictive utility, and suggested that a serious attempt to define and understand the nature of father nurturance would best serve the field. In so doing, Fogel, Melson, and Mistry (1986) defined paternal nurturance as the fostering of optimal development suitable to the child's level of growth, which consists of three major aspects of childrearing: a) guidance of the child (e.g., the teaching, discipline, and socialization of the child), b) protection of the child (e.g., sheltering, providing for, and making decisions regarding the child), and c) care of the child (e.g., the warmth expressed toward the child, the physical care of the child, and play interaction with the child).

While existing research suggests that father nurturance provides an important influence in the socioemotional development of children (e.g., Cowan & Cowan, 1987), the determinants of father nurturance
remain unclear. The aim of the present study was to address this issue by examining the relative influence of the father's personal attributes (i.e., motivation to nurture his children, personality type, parental beliefs and attitudes), experience in child care, and sociocultural factors as potential influences on paternal nurturance.

Impact of Father Nurturance on Child Development

In general, the research on father nurturance and its influence on child development emphasizes the importance of a warm father-child relationship for young children, which should be established in early childhood in order to foster well-adjusted development. Father nurturance has been linked to the development of both instrumental behaviors (e.g., sex-role development, independence and achievement, and internal locus of control) and expressive behaviors (e.g., empathy, and healthy personality functioning) in children. Paternal influences on these aspects of child development are reviewed below.

Sex-role Development

Social learning theory suggests that the child's sex-role identification would be among the characteristics most likely to be influenced by the nurturance of the father because fathers are more concerned with "appropriate" sex-typed behavior than
mothers (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Goodenough, 1957; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957), and they reinforce and punish sex-typed behavior more consistently than mothers (Langlois & Downs, 1980). Research also dictates that fathers are particularly salient to children of the same sex (Lamb, 1977, 1981; Parke & Sawin, 1977), with boys identifying with fathers who most often influence their behavior through reward and punishment (Biller, 1971).

According to social learning theory, the important criterion determining the degree of filial identification depends on the father's nurturance (e.g., Bandura & Walters, 1959; Biller, 1971; Mussen, 1967). In line with this reasoning, a number of studies have found a relationship between paternal nurturance and enhanced masculinity in boys (i.e., the boy's perception of himself as a male facilitated by his perceived similarity to his father). Mussen and Distler (1959, 1960), for example, utilized the It Scale to determine sex-role orientation in boys. The results showed that highly masculine-oriented boys had fathers who were more affectionate and nurturant, and who took more responsibility in child rearing. In addition, Biller (1969), who used the It Scale and Draw-a-Person measures, found that kindergarten boys' views of paternal nurturance were related to their masculine orientation.

Freedheim (1961) also found that paternal nurturance
was related to masculinity in boys from the second through fifth grades. He used the It Scale and doll play to determine their sex-role orientation. The results indicated that father-doll choice in completing doll-play stories was related to father dominance and father nurturance. This author contends that nurturing fathers contribute indirectly to the masculine development in their sons, hence observational learning appears to mediate sex-role orientation in young boys.

Payne and Mussen (1956) found that adolescent boys would rate high on a masculinity measure of a questionnaire when their father was perceived as having nurturant qualities (e.g., rewarding, gratifying, understanding). In a similar vein, Moulton, Burnstein, Liberty, & Altercher (1966) found that college men were more likely to indicate masculine preferences on a questionnaire when their father was considered a dominant disciplinarian as well as a nurturant parent. Sons of dominant but non-nurturant fathers showed less traditional masculine preferences and sons were more likely to have high opposite-sex preferences when their mother was the dominant and nurturant parent.

Research on the father's influence in shaping boys' sex-role concepts has been demonstrated extensively by Emihovich, Gaier, and Cronin (1984), who investigated the
effects of role modeling on boys' sex-role identification and behavior. In two analyses, they first examined the relationship between fathers' self-sex-role beliefs and their expectations for their sons. In the second analysis, they tested the relationship between the father's expectations for their sons and the son's actual responses. The results showed strong positive relationships between fathers' and sons' sex-role beliefs and expectations; fathers who had less traditional sex roles for themselves and had less stereotyped expectations for their sons had sons who matched their fathers' expectations. The same results were found for sons of fathers who had traditional and stereotypical beliefs and expectations. The authors suggest that despite ongoing changes in today's society regarding the perception of the male sex-role, the father is still the key figure in determining the son's gender identity, and the father's beliefs and expectations are strong influences on their son's beliefs.

With regard to feminine sex-role development, the extent to which the father has the ability to reward particular behaviors is a significant influence on his daughter's sex-role orientation. The father's acceptance and reinforcement of his daughter's positive femininity greatly facilitates the development of her self-concept, but a negative or overly rigid view of femininity can
hamper her social and sexual development (Biller, 1971).

Studies have shown that fathers reward their male and female children differently, encouraging instrumental behavior in sons and expressive behavior in daughters (e.g., Parson, 1955; Johnson, 1963). Biller (1971) states that a father can facilitate his daughter's femininity as long as he perceives feminine behavior as a means of positive psychological adjustment in the child. Femininity can be facilitated by the father, for example, by his encouraging of instrumental behaviors in interpersonal communication such as expressiveness, warmth, and sensitivity where the needs of others are important (e.g., Biller, 1971; Biller & Weiss, 1970).

Consonant with this contention, Goodenough (1957) found that fathers of nursery school children had a greater interest in sex differences, and thus, encouraged their daughters to develop skills used in social interactions. Similarly, Cox and Cox (1978) found that in intact families, fathers of extremely feminine 4- to 6-year old girls were nurturant with their daughters, actively involved with them, and reinforced their expressive behaviors.

With regard to long-lasting effects of father nurturance on feminine development, the literature suggests that interaction with a masculine and nurturant father provides a girl with basic experiences that she
can generalize in her adult relationships with other males. For example, Lozoff (1974) suggests from a study of upper-middle-class individuals that father-daughter relationships are crucial in the development of women who are successful in both heterosexual relationships and in their creative, professional endeavors. Such women had brilliant fathers who were personally secure, vital, and achievement-oriented. They treated their daughters with respect, and encouraged and expected them to develop their competencies without infringement of sex-role stereotypes. There was much compatibility between their parents, and the daughters developed positive identifications with both of them, as well as comfortable feminine sex-role orientations.

In summary, father nurturance appears to play a principal role in the development of a child's sex-role identity. Nurturant fathers, more than mothers, encourage sex-appropriate behavior in their children and, coupled with an affective and attentive concern for their children, serve as a nurturant, masculine role model for boys to imitate, and for girls to develop secure feminine self-concepts.

Independence and Achievement

Research examining the effects of father nurturance on the development of young children's independence and achievement in problem-solving tasks renders support for
the contention that the nurturant father can impart specific benefits to his child.

Biller (1974) defines the "well-fathered" infant as having received a high level of father interaction in the father-child relationship. The author suggests that mothers and fathers react differently to their infant's attempts at exploring the environment--fathers typically encourage their baby's curiosity, urging them to attempt to solve cognitive and motoric challenges, while mothers are more likely to inhibit the child's exploration. In Biller's observations, well-fathered infants appeared more secure and trustful in branching out in their explorations. There were also indications that their motor development, in terms of crawling, climbing, and manipulating objects, was advanced. This author speculates that fathers, when they are involved with their children, tend to be more tolerant than mothers of physical explorations by infants. These fathers were also observed to encourage their infants both vocally and gesturally to crawl or climb a little further. This may have an impact on fostering a child's sense of mastery over the environment.

Consistent with Biller's (1974) findings, Kotelchuck (1976) investigated 12- to 21- month-old babies who were left alone with a stranger in a play session. Babies who were cared for primarily by their mothers showed
extensive distress and protest when left alone. Children whose fathers were nurturant were more likely to find the experiment an enjoyable play session and were not distressed when left alone with strangers. Kotelchuck speculates that since protest commences by 12 months, father nurturance may slow down the onset of protest in children. These studies suggest that the father provides an additional attachment figure for the child thereby making it easier for the child to relate to other relatives and friends. A child who has frequent interactions with both parents (except if the mother has an inhibiting effect on the child's explorations of the environment) has access to a wider variety of experiences and may be more adaptive to the separation from his parents.

After extensive histories and observations of the father-infant dyad in the home, Pruett (1983) examined babies in a laboratory setting using the Yale Developmental Schedules to assess their developmental competence in gross and fine motor performance, adaptive problem-solving, language skills, and personal-social function. The author discovered that babies who were cared for primarily by their fathers readily engaged in and were enthusiastic about new problem-solving experiences. None of the children were described as being afraid of strangers—they were curious, cautious,
subdued—but not fearful. The majority of the infants functioned above the expected norms on the standardized tests of development. The youngest group of infants (1 to 12 months) often performed problem-solving tasks on a level of babies four to eight months their senior; personal and social skills were two to six months ahead of schedule. In a subsequent study, older babies in a similar group (12 to 22 months) performed as well (Pruett, 1989). Overall, Pruett found that children in this study who were raised primarily by men were vigorous, thriving, and competent had infants who were especially comfortable and interested in their external environment.

Consonant with Pruett's findings, Pedersen et al. (1987) observed father-infant interactions in a home environment where fathers provided more extensive care for the infant in the absence of the mother. Infants showed higher rates of responding to their fathers and more frequent instances of exploratory behavior than when mothers were present. The authors suggest that the enhanced relationship of the father contributes to differentiation in the mother-infant relationship and reinforces the infant's approaches to the extended environment.

Easterbrooks and Goldberg (1984) found that father involvement was strongly associated with problem-solving
behavior (e.g., positive affect and task-orientation) of the child. Children who had fathers who encouraged toddler autonomy and provided spontaneous encouragement to their children exhibited positive affect (e.g., frequency, intensity, and duration of emotional expressiveness assessed by facial, vocal, and bodily behaviors) and consistent task orientation (e.g., degree of child self-directedness assessed by autonomous effort, persistence, off-task behavior, and type of reorientation to task behavior) when observed with their fathers in a problem-solving task.

In summary, the nurturant father can do much to foster the development of his child's independent and competent functioning, as well as to motivate him or her to achieve success. The father who is decisive and competent and also allows his child to be independent facilitates his child's ability to cope with his environment. In addition, high achievement-oriented fathers of adolescent boys encourage their sons' self-reliance and independence (i.e., Rosen & D'Andrade, 1959). As Biller (1971) posits, the father's role in fostering the development of independence and achievement in the child revolves around acting as a salient, nurturant model and encouraging the child to make his or her own decisions.

Empathy
Several studies (e.g., Rutherford & Mussen, 1968; Speece, 1967) suggest that children of nurturant fathers who are actively involved in child rearing develop greater generosity and altruism than children of less nurturant fathers. Hoffman (1970) found that nurturant fathers who had a positive approach to child rearing instill a greater level of moral internalization in their children. Lamb (1976, 1981) stated that warm and sensitive fathers help lay the basis for social competence in the child and establish a better capability for interpersonal relationships. He contends that nurturant father behavior determines the security of father-infant relationships, and secure relationships foster the ability to relate positively to others.

Sagi (1982) found that children who had nurturant fathers scored highest on Borke's Empathy test, and further contends that it is the supportive and nurturant involvement in childrearing that is necessary for the development of empathy. He speculates that the potential for the development of interpersonal skills in children is not fully materialized in "traditional" families where fathers display less expressive qualities and more instrumental skills. Sagi suggests that in these families insufficient paternal nurturance appears to decrease children's empathy; hence, it seems that paternal involvement in child rearing facilitates the
transmission of empathic skills (via the socialization process) with which the child learns to identify.

**Locus of Control**

The literature on the father's impact on the child's development indicates that warm and nurturant fathering, the father's encouragement for independent functioning in the child, and the comfortable and secure sense of self reflected in the father's behavior fosters the acquisition of an internal locus of control in children.

Sagi (1982), for example, states that the nurturance of highly involved fathers facilitates their children's acquisition of an internal locus of control. He suggests that nurturant fathers who rely on their children and themselves to take an active role in household chores and family problems do so with emotional support, guidance, and love. These fathers promote their children's level of independence and enhance their sense of control over the situation. Sagi found that children of nurturant fathers consistently exhibited a more internal locus of control as measured by the Stanford Preschool Internal-External Scale.

In a similar vein, Radin (1981) reported that preschoolers who showed greater internal locus of control had fathers who were responsible for the majority of child care. She suggested that paternal nurturance enhances the development of children's beliefs that they
control the contingencies in the world about them. Nurturant fathers who are actively involved in the rearing of their children are more likely to display both expressive and instrumental qualities and are comfortable in non-normative parental roles. Often called "role-innovators" (i.e., one who deviates from normative roles; see Aldous, 1974), the father's behavior, characterized by flexibility and a secure sense of control over the situation, serves to represent a state of internal locus of control which the child can imitate. Modeling theory would argue that children perceive and identify with their father's internal locus of control, especially if the father is nurturant and available to the child.

To summarize, fathers who exhibit a secure sense of self, who display warmth and nurturant behaviors (i.e., support, guidance, affection), and who promote and depend on their children's ability to solve problems, represent in themselves, and thus, foster in their children an internal locus of control.

Personality Adjustment

Research on the impact of father nurturance on personality adjustment suggests that a father's warmth and care may be important to the infant's coping ability (e.g., in stressful situations and with social responsiveness). In adult personality adjustment, paternal nurturance appears to enhance later personality
functioning especially when the father's nurturance has a warm, expressive quality, and he is available to the child. Kotelchuck's (1976) study found that 6 to 24 month-old infants were better able to withstand stress if fathers were nurturant and involved in child care tasks (e.g., bathing and dressing). Similarly, Parke and Sawin (1977) found that when fathers tended to the daily care of their 8 to 12 month-old babies, the babies tended to be more socially responsive and generally better able to withstand stressful situations.

Paternal nurturance in childhood also appears to be important to adult personality adjustment. Fish and Biller (1973) investigated college females' perceptions of their relationships with their fathers during childhood by means of an extensive family background questionnaire. Subjects who perceived their fathers as having been very nurturant and positively interested in them scored high on the Adjective Check List personal adjustment scale. By contrast, daughters of fathers who were perceived as rejecting scored very low on the personal adjustment measure. Similarly, Reuter and Biller (1973) investigated the relationship between perceived paternal nurturance and availability, and personality adjustment among college males. A family background questionnaire was also used to assess perceptions of father-child relationships and the amount
of time fathers spent at home. The results indicated that high paternal nurturance coupled with at least moderate paternal availability and high paternal availability coupled with at least moderate paternal nurturance were related to high scores on the personality adjustment measures (i.e., the personal adjustment scale of Gough and Heilbrun's Adjective Check List and the Socialization Scale of the California Psychological Inventory). Conversely, subjects with low scores on these personality adjustment measures were associated with high paternal availability combined with low paternal nurturance and high paternal nurturance combined with low paternal availability. These studies suggest that the important "ingredients" of paternal nurturance seem to include warmth of the father coupled with his physical availability to the child (especially as they relate to later personality adjustment). In support of this, Biller (1981) reported that males who had fathers at home much of the time but who gave them little attention seemed to be especially handicapped in their psychological functioning. He contends that the non-nurturant father is an inadequate model, and that his consistent presence may be a detriment to the child's personality functioning.

Similarly, the father who is highly nurturant but seldom home may be a source of frustration for the child
because the father represents an elusive, difficult-to-imitate figure. This imbalance in the affective and proximal father-child relationship has precipitated the suggestion that children of non-nurturant fathers may be better off if the father is not very available (Biller, 1981). This concurs with evidence from studies on father-absent children who evince better personality adjustments than children with passive, ineffectual fathers (e.g., Biller, 1971, 1974).

In summary, children raised by nurturant, warm, and available fathers tend to be more empathetic, independent, and have a greater internal locus of control than children of non-nurturant fathers. Modeling theory suggests that nurturant fathers are more likely to reinforce children's behaviors that they themselves represent and value in their lives. Nurturant fathers typically are characterized as role innovators who possess an internal locus of control in order to maintain a nonnormative paternal role. Such fathers value independence in themselves and promote similar behaviors in their children.

Father nurturance also appears to enhance infant's adjustment to stressful situations, as well as having long-term benefits for personality adjustment in adulthood. The research suggests that the critical factor in promoting adult personal functioning during
childhood is contingent upon having both a moderately to highly nurturant father and a moderately to highly available father.

The literature reviewed thus far has marshalled the value of father nurturance on child development. Moreover, the impact of paternal nurturance on the child warrants a further examination of the antecedents of father nurturance; hence, a synthesis of this topic follows.

Antecedents of Father Nurturance

The literature on father nurturance suggests that there are three main clusters of factors which influence the extent to which fathers are nurturant towards their children: **Personal attributes** (i.e., personal attributes of the father such as his motivation to nurture, personality type, parenting beliefs and attitudes), **previous experience in child care** (i.e., how much previous experience fathers have had in child care), and **sociocultural factors** (i.e., what types of early socialization, socioeconomic status', and social network processes influence the level of father's nurturance).

Personal Attributes

The extent to which fathers participate in nurturing their children is influenced by a number of personal attributes of the father, including the father's motivation to nurture, his personality characteristics,
his beliefs about parenting, and his attitudes about the existence of a maternal instinct.

**Motivation.** Lamb (1986) describes motivation as "the extent to which the father wants to be involved in the care of his children" (p. 18). Russell (1986) contends that when fathers are motivated to increase their involvement in child care, certain salient predisposing factors are evident. He noted that fathers tended to be more motivated when they were unable to gain employment, when both the father and his spouse were employed, or when the mother was employed and had greater earning power. Motivation also tended to increase when the mother's desire to pursue a career was strong, and when egalitarian beliefs about child care and sex roles were shared by both parents. Russell also found that fathers were more likely to be nurturant toward their children when they did so out of personal choice, a form of internal motivation.

**Personality characteristics.** Several researchers (e.g., Kimball, 1984; Russell, 1983) have noted that fathers who are nurturant toward their children are more likely to possess, a priori, qualities that enable them to have nonstereotypical paternal roles. Aldous' (1974) theory of "role-makers" is relevant here. Radin (1982), referring to Aldous, states that certain personality characteristics might be expected of individuals who...
create new roles in families. She believes that nurturant fathers are more likely to possess fairly high levels of self-esteem, sensitivity, flexibility, and to have a sense of control over their destiny in order to adopt and maintain a role which has no normative guidelines. Aldous (1974) posits that fathers who possess role-maker qualities are more likely to have a nurturant role with their children because such qualities enable them to behave confidently in a caregiver role, as well as in normative gender roles.

Levy-Shiff and Israelashvili (1988) assessed the personality traits of fathers who perceived fatherhood as a self-enriching experience and who were involved in caregiving. The authors utilized Jackson's (1980) Personality Research Form to assess three personality dimensions which best reflected the fathers in the study: 1. autonomy (i.e., fathers who perceived themselves as being unattached and disliking restraints, obligations, and commitments), 2. intellectual and emotional orientation (i.e., fathers who perceived themselves as open and enjoying new intellectual and emotional experiences, as well as being sensitive and perceptive), and 3. affiliation and interpersonal interest (i.e., fathers who perceived themselves as affiliative, friendly, sociable, and warm, sympathetic, caring, affectionate, and protecting). The results indicated that
fathers who viewed fatherhood as a self-enriching experience were more likely to perceive themselves as affiliative, nurturant, and sociable. Likewise, the more involved fathers were in the caregiving of their children, the more likely they were to be open and sensitive to new experiences. Similar to Aldous's (1974) theory, the authors suggest that fathers who engage in less traditional activities are forging their own role, a process that requires flexibility and openness, characteristics consonant with Aldous' "role-maker" qualities.

Carlson (1984) demonstrated that fathers who were more expressive and nurturant in their behavior prior to the birth of their children were more likely to assume a nontraditional, highly involved parental role than fathers from traditional family patterns. However, the author emphasized that it is difficult to ascertain if differences in paternal behavior result from the experience of taking care of children, or if such differences result from differences in the father's personality. Russell (1986) also contends that it is presently unknown whether lifestyle is a consequence of personality factors or personality factors are a consequence of lifestyle.

Beliefs about parenting. Studies show that there tends to be a link between parental behavior and parental
beliefs (e.g., Russell, 1983; 1986). Russell's (1983) study found that one of the reasons that parents adopt a nontraditional lifestyle (i.e., shared-caregiving, reversed-role households) is because of their egalitarian beliefs about child care responsibilities. Of the 40 families in his study who chose to have the father take primary responsibility for the children while the mother met the economic needs of the family, 24 families stated that "the major reason for their having changed lifestyles was their ideological commitment to shared parenting and equality between the sexes" (p. 78).

The literature indicates that nontraditional fathers may tend to be less career- and work-oriented, and, therefore, less likely to endorse socially-sanctioned "traditional" paternal roles. Radin and Sagi (1982), for example, found that shared-caregiving parents placed less value on social conformity, and more value on interpersonal sensitivity, expressiveness, and independence in thought and action when compared to traditional parents.

Nontraditional parents are more likely to believe that child care is the family's responsibility, and, therefore, they tend to pursue work schedules designed to avoid using day care facilities. DeFrain (1979) found that couples who adopted shared-caregiving roles declared that they did so to provide positive nonstereotypical
models for their children, to enhance the mother's career, and to promote the father's involvement in child care as an expression of love.

**Attitudes about a "maternal instinct".** The traditional belief that mothers are better suited for child care and have a greater capacity for nurturance than fathers is based on an assumed, immutable belief in the biological basis of caregiver roles. Klaus, Trause, and Kennell (1975), for example, have speculated that there is a stronger innate predisposition for females to respond to infant signals than for males, while Harlow (1958) and Lorenz (1966) have contended that an hormonal mechanism is responsible for the female's superior responsiveness (and, subsequently, for her greater involvement with the child).

Regarding the belief in the existence of a maternal instinct, Russell (1983) found significant attitudinal differences between "traditional" fathers (i.e., breadwinner, playmate, disciplinarian roles), and "nontraditional" fathers (i.e., caregiver, nurturer role). A higher percentage of "traditional" than "nontraditional" fathers believed there was a maternal instinct; whereas sixty percent of the parents who did not believe in a maternal instinct reported that male-female differences in the capacity to nurture are probably more attributable to socialization factors.
rather than to genetic endowment.

Russell and Radin (1983) found that unlike traditional fathers who uphold the maternal instinct and believe that women were fundamentally better suited for parenting than they are, nurturant, nontraditional fathers are more likely to reject such attitudes.

In summary, the father's motivation to be a nurturant parent is often influenced by both the father and the mother's employment status, their career objectives, and whether the father pursued a nurturant paternal role out of choice or out of necessity. Nurturant fathers are more likely to have personality characteristics of a "role-maker" such as positive self-esteem, sensitivity, and flexibility that enable them to assume non-normative paternal roles confidently and successfully. Such fathers also place high value on egalitarian parental roles, are more likely to be less career-oriented, and they tend to dismiss the likelihood of the existence of a "maternal instinct." Furthermore, it is uncertain if it is a change in the parent's role as caregiver that influences a parent's attitudes, or if parents who reject such attitudes are more likely to assume nontraditional lifestyles (e.g., Russell, 1986).

Experience in Child Care

Child care skills. Lamb et al. (1987) state that it is also possible—if not probable—that females are more
likely than males to seek out, be offered, and learn from opportunities to acquire child-care skills. Thus, being male or female may play a role in shaping—but not necessarily determining or ensuring—sex differences in parenting skills.

By tradition, taking care of children and the home have commonly been the mother's and daughter's responsibilities, whereas tending to "outdoor" duties has remained within the male's domain (e.g., Parke & Sawin, 1980). From early childhood, tending to the needs of siblings and exposure to caregiving tasks has been subscribed to females.

Having had experience with children appears to enhance the realization of skill acquisition in parental caregiving. In DeFrain's (1979) study of androgenous parents (i.e., those who share child care and job/career responsibilities relatively equally), the results of a questionnaire survey examining the precursors in the parent's childhood or adult life that prepared him or her for parenthood revealed that the experience of caring for children before he or she had children was rated as either first, second, or third in importance by 28% of the subjects in the sample.

Similarly, Soule, Standley, and Copans (1979) postulated that early and extensive contact with children could be advantageous for future fathering since a man
who has learned how to be socially and emotionally comfortable with children is more likely to be more comfortable with his own role of being a nurturant parent. Using an interview method, they investigated various precursors to the development of father identity in 70 prospective fathers, and they found that men who were anticipating fathering reported little awkwardness around infants and enjoyed opportunities to hold and play with them. The authors suggest that the impending birth of their own child may foster infant contact rather than fathers having a fondness for babies.

Fein (1976) also researched men's preparation for parenthood by examining men in both prenatal and postnatal interviews. Men who had had more experience caring for children prior to the birth of their child expected to be more involved in caring for their infants than other men in the prenatal interview. The results indicated that these men were indeed more involved with the care of their babies (and more comfortable with their role in caregiving) than other men in the postnatal interview.

Some researchers have held that parents' caretaking experience of children seems to facilitate parental responsiveness (Zelazo, Kotelchuck, Bauber, & David, 1977). For example, Gronseth (1978) reported that 66% of shared-caregiving fathers felt that they understood their
children better as a result of increased participation, and Russell (1983) noted that in a nontraditional sample, 28% of highly participant fathers and 26% of the mothers reported that fathers had a better understanding of their children and their day-to-day needs after having spent more time in child care.

Proficiency in child care is a skill wrought by both exposure and practice, and not a mere result of gender-linked competence. Lamb and Goldberg (1982) indicate that as a result of lack of exposure (through home economics courses, babysitting, and familial responsibilities), men often find themselves unskilled when faced with child care. However, once learning has been achieved, men appear as competent as women in basic baby care.

Russell (1983) believes that a father's previous experiences and knowledge are related to the degree of his current participation. He posits two criteria necessary for a father's willingness to adopt a caregiving role:

... it would be expected that fathers who (a) have more knowledge about and are more competent in child care, and (b) have had more contact and experience and therefore, are more self-confident with their children will be more likely to assume the child care role. (p. 84)
Russell (1983) argues that fathers have a potential that is equal to mothers for child care, nurturance, and sensitive responsiveness to children. He emphasizes that the necessary component to the display of nurturant behavior is the experience of child care. More specifically, Russell contends that both parents share an equal propensity for parenting but that they need the experience of child care to trigger or maintain this behavior. Furthermore, he speculates that as a result of biological changes facilitated by pregnancy and childbirth, females might have a biological system more disposed to the initiation of such parenting behaviors. Fathers, on the other hand, may have to have the experience of child care alone to rouse their response.

To summarize, a father's potential to be nurturant to his children may be enhanced by having had past experience in taking care of them. The literature suggests that the traditional manner in which boys are socialized may impede their having early experience in child care but repeated exposure can facilitate improved skills. Also, it appears that self-confidence comes with increased experience in the care of children. Therefore, fathers may realize that they can be as nurturant as mothers who have primary child care responsibilities by engaging in nurturant child rearing tasks.

Sociocultural Factors
The literature on fathering recurringly points to the development and actualization of male nurturance through the early identification with and imitation of the boy's father model. In a sociocultural context, the factors which antedate paternal nurturance are explained by modeling theory, and other relevant subjects discussed are society's expectations for sex-appropriate parental behavior, the couple's satisfaction with their marital relationship, the parent's demographic status (e.g., education, income, age), the couple's support network, and the parent's work status and job flexibility in influencing a father's nurturance.

**Modeling theory.** Jacobson (1950) stated that a man's "readiness to assume the responsibility of a father is based on identification with his own father" (p. 144). This contention is based on learning theory which argues that observational learning (modeling) and identification (imitation) are crucial aspects of personality development in the child (e.g., Mussen, 1967). The literature indicates that boys adopt their paternal role through direct reinforcement of sex-appropriate behaviors from parents, and from observational and imitation learning of the actions of same-sex models in childhood (Bandura, 1977).

Sears (1957) wrote that the actions learned by the child through imitation are those that the parent
performs in gratifying the child's needs. Subsequently, Sears, Rau, and Alpert (1965) stressed that the child's reliance on parents for meeting his or her needs, in conjunction with the parent's infrequent withdrawal of nurturance, is the mechanism that produces identification. More specifically, the child's motive to identify with the father will be the strongest when the child is given affection that is periodically withdrawn, thereby allowing the child the occasion to reproduce the father's behavior and obtain self-reinforcement. Also, Bandura and Walters (1963) found that a child need not be directly reinforced for imitating a model in order to bring about changes in behavior. Rather, the authors contend that observing a model being reinforced for a certain behavior will enhance the model's strength for imitation.

Lamb (1976) suggests that a child will be more likely to imitate a model of whom it feels positively about than one of whom it is afraid. A nurturant father compared to a nonnurturant father more frequently rewards his son's approach responses—and thus provides more opportunities for his son to observe and imitate his behavior. In this perspective, a nurturant father is a more available model than a nonnurturant father; the nurturant father's behavior is more often associated with affection and praise, and it acquires more reward value.
Thus, a boy with a nurturant father has more incentive to imitate his father than does a boy with a nonnurturant father (Biller, 1971).

**Father's relationship with own father.** Literature on father nurturance also indicates that the quality of men's relationships with their own fathers is an important influence on the nurturance they display towards their own child. The literature depicts two models of male nurturance: the "compensatory" model and the "imitative" model. The "compensatory" model contends that fathers who lacked the warmth and attention from their own fathers during childhood are determined to be more nurturant with their children than their fathers had been with them (e.g., Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Belsky & Isabella, 1985; DeFrain, 1979; Eiduson & Alexander, 1978; Grossman et al., 1980; Kimball, 1984; Radin, 1985; Russell, 1985). The "imitative model", on the other hand, states that fathers want to recreate the warm childhood relationships they had as children with their own children. Some support for this model has been found in studies of nontraditional families (e.g., Manion, 1977; Radin & Sagi, 1982; Sagi, 1982).

Taken as a whole, the processes of compensation and imitation appear to stimulate the display of father nurturance. The literature suggests that although some fathers aim to follow suit in their style of caregiving
based on the level of nurturance they received from their fathers, most fathers are seeking to improve their relationships with their children so as not to replicate the lack of paternal nurturance they experienced in childhood. Therefore, fathers who felt dissatisfied with the level of paternal nurturance they received as a child appear to be more likely to actively participate in the rearing of their children. However, on the basis of the available research, it is unclear what minimum amount of paternal nurturance is necessary for the father to be perceived as a model to imitate or a model to reject.

Social expectations. Although numerous studies have found that both mothers and fathers are equally capable of being nurturant (e.g., Berman, 1980; Lamb & Goldberg, 1982; Parke, 1979; Russell, 1983), there exists differential social pressures and expectations on men and women that can have an impact on the individual's potential to be nurturant. The traditional expectation is that women fulfill the expressive role of parenting by tending to the needs of the children and fulfilling homemaker responsibilities. Conversely, it is expected that men's fathering role is comprised of meeting the "instrumental" needs of the family by functioning as "breadwinner" and by being the masculine and authority figure in the household. In support of the above, studies suggest that the major reason why fathers do not
adopt a caregiving role is due to restrictions imposed by traditional sex-appropriate behavior expectations. Fear of being ridiculed by male peers and the attitude that caregiving is effeminate behavior are overriding issues in the literature which discusses influences on the display of father nurturance (e.g., Berman, 1980; Feldman & Nash, 1977, 1978; Feldman, Nash, & Cutrona, 1977; Lamb, 1981; Nash & Feldman, 1981; Russell, 1983).

Marital relationship. It has been suggested that the roles of father and husband are closely interwoven (e.g., Lamb & Elster, 1985; Volling & Belsky, 1985) and that there is a transfer from the quality of the couple's relationship to the quality of the father-child relationship (Cowan & Cowan, 1985). Levy-Shiff and Israelashvili (1988) found that marital satisfaction was influential in determining fathering, and Coyish (1983) postulated that a happily married man may be more nurturant and, therefore, involved with his children because the security and satisfaction he feels in his relationship with his wife transcends to his relationship with his children. Yogman (1983) also found that fathers were more involved with their infants when they were more satisfied and happy with their relationships with their wives.

In a longitudinal study of couples from late pregnancy to 6 to 8 months postpartum, Feldman, Nash, and
Aschenbrenner (1983) found that fathers were more nurturant towards their babies when they had higher marital satisfaction. The researchers suggested that "the quality of the marital dyad, whether it be reported by husband or wife, is the one most powerful predictors of paternal involvement and satisfaction" (p. 1634). Grossman, Eichler, and Winickoff (1980), and Lamb (1986) echo this position by postulating that marital satisfaction is related to many indices of individual satisfaction for men and women, as well as to the quality of their relationships with their children. Lamb (1986) found that increased father nurturance is a function of marital satisfaction when increased caregiving is opted for by choice rather than by necessity.

Russell (1986) posits that the mother's influence in the decision to adopt and continue a nontraditional lifestyle is an important factor in the father's level of child care participation. Barnett and Baruch (1984) found that when mothers endorsed a nontraditional lifestyle (i.e., employed, career-oriented, encouraging of father's involvement in child care), fathers were more prone to participate in a caregiving role. McHale and Huston (1984) also found that fathers were more involved when mothers held egalitarian beliefs about parenting. Along the same line, Radin (1985) found a correlation between high levels of paternal involvement and the
father's support of the mother's career.

Egalitarian beliefs about sex roles, child care task allocation, and career objectives appear to be shared among mothers and fathers in nontraditional families. However, some research indicates that many mothers do not want increased participation from their spouses (Pleck, 1982). One survey indicated that 23% of employed and 31% of unemployed mothers desired more help with the children, and 42% of employed mothers in another survey requested the same of fathers (Lamb et al., 1987). These data reveal that although some fathers are receiving encouragement from their wives to become more involved, many fathers may not be, regardless of their motivation for or competence in caregiving.

The mother's relationship with her own father appears to be another factor influencing her husband's nurturance. Radin (1981) found that a mother's feelings about her own father (who was demonstrably affective but uninvolved in child care tasks) and her perceptions of his role in her early upbringing were highly correlated with her husband's level of involvement in child care. Radin speculates that the mother's desire to encourage her husband's capacity for nurturance as well as promote his competence in child care may be a consequence of having found her own father's display of affection gratifying.
Socioeconomic factors. There are controversial findings in the literature about the relationship between social class and father nurturance. "Traditional cultural transmission theory" (Russell, 1982) posits that new lifestyles are expected to originate among the highly educated, professional (i.e., upper- and middle-) classes. In support of this position are studies by Kohn (1967), Hollingshead (1968), and Rosen (1967) that contend that a parent's educational and occupational background is associated with the parent's choice of caregiver role and the cognitive and psychosocial development of their child. The authors state that fathers with higher education and who are of the middle- to upper- socioeconomic classes tend to be more nurturant.

Conversely, Radin and Sagi (1982) noted that in an American sample, the father's socioeconomic status was inversely related to the child care index of availability. In other words, the more time the father was available to his preschooler, the fewer hours he was employed, and the lower his economic status. Also, recent research has shown that when men have lower status occupations than their wives (e.g., when men work fewer hours than their wives), fathers tend to become more active in parenting (Cowan & Cowan, 1987).

In a study of single-custodial fathers, Hanson (1986) found that social class is not a potent predictor
of a man's ability to relate in a nurturing way to children. Furthermore, Russell's (1982) study of Australian shared-caregiving families found that fathers' occupations differed widely (e.g., lawyer, milkman, laborer, university professor), and that 30% of the fathers could be classified as either semiskilled or unskilled.

Some research has also found that high levels of father participation are correlated with high degrees of maternal education. Russell (1982) found that in families that had chosen to adopt nontraditional parental roles, mothers were more likely to be highly educated, and mothers and fathers tended to have higher status occupations. Russell speculates that highly educated mothers are more likely to have familiarized themselves with the current literature on child care and parental roles—in particular, the literature which emphasizes the value of the father's involvement in the upbringing of children.

Ericksen, Yancey, and Ericksen (1979) speculate that mothers with higher levels of education (compared to their husbands) are more likely to hold better paying jobs and thereby have greater bargaining power with regard to household chores and child care responsibilities. On the other hand, Russell and Radin (1983) argue that these mothers may be less likely to
identify themselves with a maternal role, tending instead to have been socialized toward a nontraditional sex role, and feel less threatened by highly participant husbands at home.

Support systems. Social approval and encouragement have been determined to be vital factors in increasing and maintaining paternal nurturance. Even if mothers are supportive of their husband's nurturance of their children, other individuals who are significant in a father's life may not be. Relatives, friends, and workmates may not approve or encourage the father's interest in domestic affairs.

Russell (1983) gathered data on the critical reactions of the significant others of shared-caregiving fathers and mothers. General and specific reactions of relatives, close friends, neighbors, and workmates revealed some interesting trends. For example, Russell asked parents how other people they knew generally felt about their role in parenting. Reports indicated that 42% of the reactions were positive, 34% were negative, and 18% felt "confused" and had had difficulty understanding their lifestyle (p.134). Regardless of whether the general reactions were positive or negative, all of the reactions seemed to remind the couples of how different they were from the norm.

Russell inquired about relatives' reactions to the
couple's roles. Forty-two percent of the families reacted with negative comments to the couple, 33% responded with support, and 24% revealed both negative and positive reactions (e.g., the mother's relatives were supportive but the father's were not). Negative reactions directed to fathers were mainly concerned with the father's interest in work commitments and career growth. Mothers were repeatedly questioned about their performance as "good mothers" and the effect their career and absence would have on the children. Russell also asked about the reactions of close friends, neighbors, and workmates. The results indicated that the gender of these significant individuals was an important factor in the reactions disclosed. In all cases, the reactions of women were more supportive than those of men: sixty-nine percent of female friends and neighbors felt positive about this situation, whereas only 44% of the male counterparts responded in a positive manner. In the workplace, 64% of the female co-workers were supportive in contrast to the 34% of male co-workers who felt the same.

The men in the sample reported repeated negative encounters and comments from other men. These caregiving fathers complained of constant onslaughts regarding their masculinity and adequacies as men. In addition, other men tended to belittle these fathers' roles in the home.
and rarely recognized their function as being important.

Taken at face value, therefore, women compared to men are much more supportive of men becoming caregivers. Mothers in the workplace are much more common and readily accepted by society than fathers who are active in parenting roles. Overall, mothers in the study were given more support when they chose to change roles from caregiver to worker than when fathers chose to change roles from traditional breadwinner to primary homemaker.

Couple's employment status and flexibility. In DeFrain's (1979) study, fathers expressed their need for more flexible work schedules, better-paying part-time jobs, better day care, more part-time jobs, four-day work weeks, more benefits for part-time workers, and public school day care. In response to these requests, work places have aimed to provide "flex-time" for employees who want to work varying hours, have more leisure time, and have paternity leave. However, men are still reluctant to take advantage of paternity leaves (e.g., Lamb, 1982; Lamb & Levine, 1983).

In support of increased flexible work hours, Russell (1981) found that the particular hours a father is at home and is available to his children (rather than the amount of time spent away at work and away from home) are critical factors in determining paternal nurturance. Specifically, it is not the total number of hours at work
which appears to be important but rather the particular hours a father works that are predictive of the quantity and quality of the father-child interaction (Russell & Radin, 1983). Winett and Neale (1978) found that when fathers were allowed to change their work schedules but not reduce the hours they worked, the time they spent with their families increased by 18%. For example, working weekends and working earlier or later than regular scheduled shifts facilitated fathers in taking part in school-based activities (e.g., plays and teacher conferences) as well as enabling parents to reallocate child care responsibilities (e.g., alternating work schedules in cases of child sickness when both parents are employed).

With reference to mother's work status, Lamb and Oppenheim's (1989) study indicates that levels of paternal engagement (i.e., direct, one-to-one interaction) and accessibility (i.e., being available with or without interaction) are both substantially higher in dual-career families than in families with unemployed mothers (e.g., Pleck, 1983; Lamb et al., 1987). Concordant with these findings, Barnett and Baruch (1987) found that the number of hours a mother worked per week was the strongest single predictor of father participation; the more hours the wife worked, the more time the father spent interacting with his child.
Also, the more hours the wife worked and the more nontraditional her attitude toward the male role, the greater the father's proportion of interaction time with his children relative to hers. The authors speculate, consonant with Pleck (1983), that the greater influence of mothers' versus fathers' work hours may reflect a father's participation that is less voluntary, less reflective of individual availability or preferences, and more controlled by the mother's employment-related needs.

In conclusion, there are numerous sociocultural factors which antedate father nurturance. In the social forum there are social pressures and normative expectations that will influence a father's potential to be nurturant. Fathers who pursue nurturant paternal roles may either be compensating for the lack of nurturance they received from their father during childhood or they are imitating a similar nurturant father model they had as a boy. Also, a happy and satisfying marital relationship appears to influence a father to be more attentive and nurturant to his children, especially if the mother encourages her husband's involvement with the children. The socioeconomic status of the nurturant father is predominantly from middle- to upper-middle-class, with fathers tending to be highly educated. The support of the father's social network plays an important role in
increasing and maintaining a father's nurturance, as does the mother's work status, the flexibility of the father's work hours, and the degree to which the employer will allow the father's job to accommodate his family's needs.

**Summary and Statement of Purpose**

The studies reviewed thus far evince that children do indeed thrive and prosper as a result of their father's nurturance. The impact of paternal nurturance on early child development and its consequent effects on adult functioning warrants a further examination of the factors which influence and shape the actualization of father nurturance. With this information it may become possible for social scientists, clinicians, and educators to better prepare prospective parents for their role in fostering the optimal development of their children.

Although the above studies are in general agreement about which clusters of variables (i.e., father's personal resources, experience in child care, and sociocultural factors) predict paternal nurturance, they also reflect a lack of consistency in their analyses of these precursors. To date, the lack of ubiquitous and consistent examination of the domain variables of father nurturance has led to equivocal and contradictory results. Moreover, however, there is a solid body of research which suggests that a father's early family environment acts as an overriding influence in
determining paternal nurturance. Specifically, the quality of the father's relationship with his own father has been linked to the father's capacity to be nurturant (e.g., Barnett & Baruch, 1987; DeFrain, 1979; Manion, 1977; Radin, 1985; Sagi, 1982).

The primary purpose of this exploratory study was to address the tentative hypothesis that the father's early paternal role model, whether it is nurturant or not, determines the father's role as a nurturant parent as being imitative or compensatory of his own father's nurturance. Based on modeling theory, it was expected that a father who received nurturance from his own father in childhood would imitate his father's nurturant behavior as a parent; likewise, a father who lacked having a nurturant paternal role model would either imitate his father's non-nurturant behavior or would compensate for his lack of received nurturance with his own children.

To determine the relative influence of the antecedent factors in a father's life on his adult capacity for nurturance, four hypotheses were developed. Hypothesis 1 postulated that the quality of the father's childhood relationship with his own father would best determine his current level of nurturance. The second hypothesis presumed that the father's personality dimensions and the values he attributes to the experience
of fathering would effect his current level of nurturance. Hypothesis 3 posited that the father's early experience in child care would influence his nurturant capacity, and Hypothesis 4 presumed that various sociocultural influences (i.e., father's background, support network, marital assessment, and couple's employment flexibility and satisfaction) would be influential in determining a father's nurturance. To assess each independent variable's influence, the current study measured by questionnaire the variables within each of these four antecedent clusters (i.e., father's early paternal relationship, personal resources, experience in child care, and sociocultural factors) and examined the patterns of variable relations.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 65 fathers who ranged in age from 24 to 52 years. Participants had at least one child under the age of 12, and their children ranged in age from 6 months to 25 years. Fathers were primarily caucasian, had received some college education, and were of middle to upper-middle socioeconomic class. All fathers and their spouses were employed at least 16 hours per week in order to examine the effects of employment by both parents on father's potential to be nurturant. This study was limited to examining the nurturance of married fathers only, based on the inference that married couples' commitment to parenting differs from that of unmarried couples. Table 1 reflects subject's background information.
Table 1
Background Information Of Fathers (N = 65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Range: 24 to 52 years of age (M= 36 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Asian: 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black: 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian: 83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic: 9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Some high school: 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed high school: 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college: 47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed college: 21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some graduate work: 21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed doctorate: 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income</td>
<td>15,000 or lower: 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,001 - 45,000: 44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45,001 - higher: 53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Of All Fathers Who Came From Divorced or Separated Childhood Families 0 - 18 years of age: 76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Currently in Father's Home</td>
<td>Range of number of children: 1 to 6 years (M = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range of children's ages: 0 to 25 years old (M = 6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of female children: 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of male children: 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major professionals</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser professionals</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor professionals</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiprofessionals</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled workers</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled workers</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Mean Occupation</td>
<td>M = 6.2 (Semiprofessionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Mean Occupation</td>
<td>M = 6.0 (Semiprofessionals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fathers were recruited with the help of directors of a number of preschools, child care centers, and elementary schools in Riverside and San Bernardino.
counties. Fathers were recruited in two ways. First, teachers at these facilities distribute flyers with attached participation and address forms for fathers to complete and return to them (see Appendix B). Fathers received a questionnaire by mail two weeks after returning their form to their child's school.

The second method of recruitment involved making two public announcements and approximately 30 personal, face-to-face requests to fathers to participate at a Father's Day dinner at a children's center in the city of Riverside and at several parenting classes at various agencies. Fathers who consented to participate either received a questionnaire with a pre-stamped reply envelope at the time the request was made, or they completed a participation form and received a questionnaire by mail along with a pre-stamped reply envelope (see Appendix A and B).

Approximately a total of 700 flyers were distributed by the schools and centers. Originally, 86 subjects agreed to participate. Seventy-five questionnaires were returned by fathers. Of these, ten questionnaires were omitted from the final sample due to either incomplete or improperly filled-out responses, or because subjects failed to meet the criteria for inclusion in the sample.
Measures

The questionnaire consisted of 131 items which assessed factors found in previous studies to influence father nurturance. The three general areas assessed by this study were father's background information (Part 1), father's personality, perceptions of fatherhood, and current level of nurturance (Part 2), and sociocultural determinants of father nurturance (i.e., early child care experience, early paternal relationship, marital assessment, support network, and employment) (Part 3).

Part 1

Background information. Fathers were asked to report their age, occupation, educational level, ethnicity, income status, and if applicable, their age when their parents were divorced, separated, or widowed. Fathers also stated the number, gender, and ages of their children (Appendix D, Part I).

Part 2

Father's personality characteristics. To assess the father's personality traits associated with father nurturance, the play and nurturance scales from the Personality Research Form were used (Jackson, 1967) (see Appendix D, Part II). The Nurturance scale aims to determine the degree to which one gives assistance, sympathy, and comfort to others, especially to children,
the elderly, and the disabled. Test-retest reliability for this scale was .82 with a .27 to .72 validity coefficient range.

Second, the Play scale assesses the degree to which one enjoys jovial, social, and fun-seeking activities, as well as measures one's lightheartedness and easygoing attitude. This scale had a test-retest reliability of .81 and a validity coefficient ranging from .42 to .55. Both scales are composed of 20 items each, which are presented in Likert-scale format (i.e., 1 = strongly agree; 5 = strongly disagree) (Jackson, 1967).

Perception of fatherhood. Based on Levy-Shiff and Israelashvili's (1988) study (see Appendix D, Part IX), in which the authors defined the experience of fatherhood as a father's means to satisfy and gratify his own social and psychological needs, the researchers based their definition on Hoffman and Hoffman's (1973) extensive report of the value of children to parents. Their questionnaire measured fathers' perception and value of fatherhood. In particular, it measured two necessary composites of fathers who have a positive fathering experience: 1) a positive perception of the role as a father, and 2) the value of the fathering role as a self-fulfilling and positive experience. In the current study, this measure was based on the semantic differential technique (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum,
1957). Rated on a 7-point, 8-item scale, key stimulus sentences were accompanied by bipolar pairs of descriptive adjectives (i.e., "To me, being a father is.....satisfying-disappointing, meaningful-meaningless). This scale had Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .89 in the study cited.

**Father's perception of fathering experience and nurturance.** In open-ended question format, this measure (Appendix D, Part X) was comprised of two parts. First, fathers were requested to address the positive and negative aspects of their experience in fathering, and second, fathers were asked to describe in their own words what a "nurturant" father was.

**Father's nurturance.** This measure assessed fathers' levels of nurturance. Radin's (1985) Paternal Involvement in Child Care Index (PICCI) was used and modified for the purposes of this present study (see Appendix D, Part VII). To maintain a conceptual congruency of paternal nurturance and to simplify the analyses employed on this measure later on, this same scale was renamed the Paternal Nurturance Index (PNI), and the segment headings for each part of the PICCI had been relabelled based on Fogel, Melson, and Mistry's (1986) three-part definition of paternal nurturance (i.e., father's guidance, father's protection, and father's care). Table 2 reflects the changes that were made.
Table 2

Heading Changes Made In Paternal Involvement In Child Care Index (PICCI) For The Paternal Nurturance Index (PNI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Headings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PICCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Statement of Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Childcare Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Socialization Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Influence in Childrearing Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. When children should be disciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composed of five categories, this 22-item index assessed the following: 1) the father's involvement with his children (e.g., "How involved are you in caring for your children?") (range 0-24), 2) his care of the child (e.g., feeding the children) (range 0-12), 3) his guidance of the child (e.g., disciplining the children) (range 0-12), 4) his protection of the child (e.g., "Who in the family generally decides when children are old enough to try new things?") (range 1-10), and 5) his availability to the child (e.g., "How frequently are you
away from home days at a time?" (range 0-12). These assessments were made using different Likert-type formats regarding the frequency of activity, the father's level of involvement, and the percentage of tasks performed and by whom.

Radin (1985) measured both father's and mother's perceptions of the father's involvement in child care and combined these two scores to arrive at the final index score. The concurrent validity of the PICCI was demonstrated by high correlations between mother's total scores and father's total scores in two previous studies of 59 families with preschoolers (i.e., study 1 = .76, Radin, 1981; study 2 = .74, Radin & Goldsmith, 1985). For families with boys, the correlation was .81 in study 1 and .80 in study 2. For families with girls, the correlation was .75 in study 1 and .80 in study 2. The correlation coefficient of study 1 with study 2 PICCI grand total scores was .52 (Radin & Goldsmith, 1985). Cronbach's alpha for the four sets of data include .67 for fathers in study 1 and .68 in study 2, and .75 for mothers' scores in study 1 and .69 in study 2. All correlations were significant at the .001 level.

Based on the PICCI's correlation coefficient figures, the PNI in the present study omitted measuring the mother's responses to the questions and expected to obtain reliable and meaningful results from the fathers
Part 3

Father's early child care experience. Consisting of six items, this measure assessed each father's early experiences in caring for children (see Appendix D, Part VIII). Fathers were asked to respond to four different types of questions. First, on a Likert scale, fathers were asked to rate the frequency with which they were exposed to and had had previous child care experience before becoming parents (i.e., 1 = very frequently; 5 = very seldom). Second, fathers were asked to determine which of his parents was most responsible for encouraging his choice of a father role. Third, subjects stated the degree of masculinity and femininity they were most influenced to pursue as a child when role-playing a father (i.e., 1 = very masculine, 5 = very feminine). The final item asked fathers to describe their experiences (in an open-ended question format) interacting with children prior to the birth of their own children.

Father's relationship with own father. To assess the quality of the father's relationship with his own father during childhood, Reuter and Biller's (1973) Four Psychological Presence scales were used (see Appendix D, Part III). This scale contained four subscales: 1) Nurturance (Nur) (i.e., the subject's perception of his
own father's expression of love for him as a child), 2) Positive Involvement (Pos) (i.e., the father's perception of his own father's enjoyment when doing things with him as a child), 3) Limit Setting (Lim) (i.e., the father's perception of his own father when he corrected and tried to improve his behavior as a child), and 4) Rejection (Rej) (i.e., the father's recollection of his own father's behavior when he felt like he was a big problem to his father as a child). These four scales consisted of five items each that were presented in a Likert-type format (e.g., 1 = very seldom, 5 = very frequently), yielding a possible score range of 5-25 for each scale. A low score on each scale refers to negative parental qualities while a high score relates to positive parental qualities as perceived by the father.

Cited in Reuter and Biller (1973), chi-square analyses for goodness of fit for these scales were 5.00 for Nur (p < .05), 12.16 for Pos (p < .001), 60.60 for Lim (p < .001), and 95 for Rej (p < .001), safely assuming that the scales are valid measures of the construct definitions assigned to them.

Marital assessment. To assess the quality of subject's marital relationships, Locke and Wallace's (1959) Marital Adjustment Questionnaire was used. This scale measures the emotional and functional aspects of marriage (see Appendix D, Part V). This 15-item scale
classifies two conceptually distinct areas of marital relationships: a) the couple's consensus about functioning in different domains of family life (e.g., handling family finances), and b) the couple's marital satisfaction (e.g., feeling happy about the marriage). Possible scores ranged from 0 to 158 points. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .89 and .81, respectively.

Father's support system. To assess each father's support network, Holtzman and Gilbert's (1987) Social Network Scale was used. The first part of the scale measured the quantity of the father's support network and consisted of five items with a 7-point Likert response format (e.g., 1 = very little, 7 = very much). An example of an item is "How much moral support do you receive?" To measure the degree of father satisfaction with the existing quantity of the support he receives, the second part of the scale consisted of another five items with a 7-point Likert response format, (e.g., 1 = very unsatisfied, 7 = very satisfied). An example of an item is "How satisfied are you with your present network?" The range of possible scores for each scale were 5 to 35; high scores indicate lower levels of stress and high effectiveness in its management. Cronbach's alpha for this segment was .72.

The third part, Spousal Support, was used to measure the father's moral support and assistance typically
received from his spouse in the following areas: child care, household maintenance, work activities, and maintaining the marital relationship. Using a 7-point, 4-item Likert scale (e.g., 1 = very little to 7 = very much), possible scores ranged from 4 to 28. High scores indicate a high degree of spousal support. Cronbach's alpha for this segment was .79. (See Appendix D, Part IV).

Fathers' and mothers' employment status and pattern. This measure was based on two questions posed by Barnett and Baruch's (1987) study. The present study developed a 5-item, 7-point scale by extrapolating subsequent questions on father's and mother's satisfaction and flexibility with their work schedule from the original two (see Appendix D, Part VI). Fathers also reported the types of occupations their wives had.

Procedure

Fathers who received a questionnaire by mail or in person completed the survey at their leisure in a location of their choice. Fathers were instructed to complete and return their questionnaire within two weeks from its initial receipt.

A total of five months was allotted to collect the maximum number of completed questionnaires possible. At the end of four months, fifty reminder cards were mailed out to those fathers who had initially completed a
participation form and received a questionnaire but had not yet returned their copy. Ten questionnaires were returned as a result of this effort. Two subjects who had volunteered their address information and who had not completed their returned questionnaire in full had it returned for completion. These questionnaires were returned complete.

Thirty-one fathers who wished to receive a copy of the study's results completed a voluntary response form (see Appendix E, F, G). Eleven subjects included personal comments regarding the questionnaire and its effects on them. The subjects, preschools and children's centers that participated were sent a copy of the results as well as certificates of appreciation.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Overview

Four hypotheses were formulated to determine the best predictors of paternal nurturance. The analyses included t-tests, chi-squares, Pearson product-moment correlations, and a hierarchical regression. Hypothesis two was strongly supported by these analyses, indicating that a father's personality attributes are important predictors of paternal nurturance. The quantity of support fathers receive in fathering, likewise, was valuable in the prediction model. The chi-square analyses in all four hypotheses showed that high-nurturant and low-nurturant fathers differed significantly in their responses to open-ended questions about their early experiences interacting with children, their experience being a father, their descriptions of a nurturant father, and their requests for change in the current support they currently receive in fathering.

Preliminary Analyses

Subjects were divided into two groups based on their score on the PNI (i.e., high-nurturant subjects scoring at or above the group mean = 40.54; low-nurturant subjects scoring lower than the group mean). With a range of 0 to 72 points, high-nurturant scores ranged
from 40.54 to 52.20, and low-nurturant scores ranged from 16.50 to 40.30.

Although t-test results on the demographic variables (i.e., age, occupation, education, income, number of children, and spouse's occupation) revealed no significant differences among high- and low-nurturant father groups (see Table 3), it is important to note that over half of the subjects were categorized as having high socioeconomic status which may reflect, apriori, that the participants were already predisposed to be nurturant based on the literature which found that nurturant fathers are more likely to be classified as socioeconomically high.

Table 3

Mean Comparisons Between High-Nurturant and Low-Nurturant Father Groups on Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of children</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupation</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated that a father's relationship with his own father during childhood would predict his adult capacity to be nurturant to his own children.

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed on the father's nurturance scores and the scores in the Nurturant, Rejecting, Limit-Setting, and Positive quality scales which measured the father's childhood relationship with his own father (Table 4). No significant relationships were found. To determine if extraneous variables might mask a relationship between these variables, a partial Pearson correlation was calculated on the four independent father variables while controlling for father's age, occupation, ethnicity, education, income, and the number of children currently in the home. The results showed that the Rejecting quality of the father's childhood relationship with his own father was significantly negatively correlated with paternal nurturance.

An interesting trend indicated that after controlling the six demographic variables, the strength of the relationship between paternal nurturance and each independent variable increased. Table 4 demonstrates that a father's age, occupation, ethnic and socioeconomic
class, education, and the number of children he has
probably does clarify the quality of the subject's
relationship with his father and his current capacity to
be nurturant to his own children.

Table 4
Complete and Partial Pearson Product-Moment Correlations:
Differences in Coefficients for Father's Relationship
Qualities Prior To and After Controlling For Demographic
Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
<th>Father Nurturance Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit-Setting</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-tests were performed comparing high-nurturant and
low-nurturant father groups on the Nurturant, Rejecting,
Limit-Setting, and Positive quality variables. Table 5
shows that there were no significant differences among
the two groups on these variables, suggesting that
regardless of the type of relationship subjects had with
their own fathers, their capacity to be nurturant to
their children appears unrelated to the quality of that
early childhood relationship.
Table 5
Mean Comparisons Between High-Nurturant and Low-Nurturant Fathers on Relationship Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
<th>High-Nurturant Fathers (n=33) M</th>
<th>Low-Nurturant Fathers (n=32) M</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit-Setting</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize, the results of the correlation and t-test analyses for Hypothesis 1 indicate that the quality of the father's early paternal relationship is not significantly associated to father nurturance. Subjects who were either high-nurturant or low-nurturant fathers did not differ significantly from each other with respect to the quality of the relationship they had with their own fathers in childhood.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis stated that the father's personality might predict paternal nurturance. The following analyses examined how certain personality factors related to father nurturance (e.g., the father's personality characteristics of nurturance and playfulness, his perception of fathering, his personal responses...
regarding his experience being a father, and his description of a "nurturant" father).

A complete and partial Pearson correlation was calculated in order to determine if there were significant correlations between father nurturance and the personality variables of nurturance, playfulness, and the perception of fathering. For each personality variable—in both the complete and partial correlations—there were significant positive relationships among each of the personality variables and father nurturance before and after controlling for father's age, occupation, ethnicity, education, income, and the number of children currently in the home. Table 6 reflects this outcome.

Table 6

Complete and Partial Correlations For Father's Personality Variables and Father Nurturance on Total Sample Before and After Controlling Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variable</th>
<th>Complete Correlation</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playfulness</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the effects the demographic variables had on the Nurturant, Rejecting, Limit-Setting, and Positive...
quality variables with father nurturance in Hypothesis one, the Nurturant, Playful, and Perception of Fathering variables were not significantly influenced by the father's demographics. Perhaps a father's well-developed and stable personality characteristics are more resistant to the influences of age, education, and income than are a father's retrospective accounts of his relationship with his own father.

Subjects were again divided into high-nurturant and low-nurturant groups based on their PNI scores. A t-test analysis of mean scores on fathers' nurturant and playful personality dimensions, and on fathers' perception of fathering for high-nurturant and low-nurturant father groups revealed two significant differences. Table 7 shows that there were significant differences between the two groups on the degree to which fathers have a playful, jovial, and fun-seeking disposition and on their perception of fathering. Contrary to expected findings, these results showed that high-nurturant fathers were more likely to perceive fathering less favorably than low-nurturant fathers.
Table 7

Mean Comparisons Between High-Nurturant and Low-Nurturant Father Groups on Personality Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variable</th>
<th>High Nurturant Fathers (n=33) M</th>
<th>Low Nurturant Fathers (n=32) M</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fathers were asked to describe their "experience being a father" in their own words. Eighty-six percent of the total sample responded to the questionnaire item. A content analysis resulted in the response categories listed in Table 8. In addition to the total group's responses, subjects' (i.e., high-nurturant and low-nurturant fathers) responses are also listed.
Table 8
Relative Percentage of Responses of Father's "Experience Being a Father" By Total Group, High-Nurturant Fathers, And Low-Nurturant Fathers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total Group (N=56)</th>
<th>High-Nurturant Fathers (n=28)</th>
<th>Low-Nurturant Fathers (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The rewards of fathering mitigate the difficulties of caring for children</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The experience has improved the father's ability to relate to children and transcended positive influences in other life areas</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fathering is highly rewarding and perceived as unequivocally impossible to substitute for by other life experiences</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fathering is difficult when determining discipline, leniency and independence for children</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fathering is sought out to compensate for the lack of essential and effective fathering received as a child</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Although rewarding, fathering is difficult when balancing demands of career and family needs</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The demands of fathering outweigh the rewards</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Learning to father is viewed as difficult and/or is often accompanied by the wish to have had children earlier in life</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, subjects stated that being a father was difficult, but that this experience was mitigated by the rewards brought about by the experience. High-nurturant fathers tended to respond in this manner more frequently (36.4%) than low-nurturant fathers (31.3%). Due to the low sample size, the chi-square analyses were utilized for descriptive purposes only. The results of chi-square analyses between the two father groups revealed that high-nurturant fathers more frequently stated that fathering was highly rewarding and impossible to substitute by other life experiences than low-nurturant fathers, $\chi^2(1, N = 8) = 7.18, p < .007$. By contrast, low-nurturant fathers stated that they sought to compensate with their children for the lack of essential fathering they received as children more frequently than high-nurturant fathers, $\chi^2(1, N = 6) = 9.51, p < .003$. Low-nurturant fathers reported significantly more frequently than their counterparts that the demands of fathering far outweighed the rewards, $\chi^2(1, N = 1) = 3.60, p < .054$. Also, low-nurturant fathers stated that they perceived fathering as difficult significantly more frequently than high-nurturant fathers, $\chi^2(1, N = 2) = 7.10, p < .008$.

Fathers responded in a similar fashion to a second question which required them to describe "a nurturant father" in their own words. Seventy-four percent of the total sample answered the question, and responses were
categorized into five major themes. Table 9 reflects the themes and the relative percentage of responses of high-nurturant and low-nurturant father groups (i.e., divided on the basis of subjects' PNI score). Subjects were divided into groups to determine if fathers who scored differently on nurturance responded differently in their descriptions of a nurturant father.

Table 9

"Descriptions of a Nurturant Father" By Total Fathers Sampled, High-Nurturant Fathers, And Low-Nurturant Fathers: Relative Percentage By Father Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Nurturant Fathers</th>
<th>Low Nurturant Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>(n=48)</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A nurturant father is one who........

1. intercepts the will of the child while nurturing the child's self-esteem.
   16.7% 12.1% 12.5%

2. is available to the child in numerous ways necessary to prompt the child to independently mediate his/her own world.
   31.3% 27.3% 18.8%

3. encourages his child's development and autonomy.
   14.6% 12.1% 9.4%

4. provides for all tangible and intangible needs of a child necessary to prosper and thrive.
   22.9% 21.2% 12.5%

5. spends time and is actively involved with his children.
   14.6% 6.1% 15.6%
Fathers in the high-nurturant group more frequently described a nurturant father by his availability to the child (27.3%) and his role as a provider to the child's needs (21.2%) than low-nurturant fathers (18.8% and 12.5%, respectively). Over one-fourth of the total fathers sampled failed to answer the previous question. The results of chi-square analyses on this open-ended question showed that low-nurturant fathers stated significantly more frequently that a nurturant father was one who spent time and was actively involved with his children than high-nurturant fathers did $\chi^2(1, N = 7) = 7.40, p< .007$. Fathers did not differ significantly on other response categories.

In summary, the analyses reflect support for Hypothesis 2. The correlation analyses revealed significant relationships between the father's capacity to nurture his children and his tendency to be of a nurturant and playful propensity. Furthermore, the results showed that a father's nurturance towards his children was strongly linked to his perceptions of fathering (i.e., fulfilling - disappointing, easy - difficult, growth - stagnation). The t-test analyses indicated that high-nurturant and low-nurturant fathers had significantly different perceptions of fathering as well as the tendency to have a jovial and playful disposition as it relates to fathering. Chi-square analyses showed that low-nurturant
fathers responded differently from high-nurturant fathers in three response categories to the open-ended question about subjects' experiences being a father. Low-nurturant fathers responded significantly more frequently than high-nurturant fathers in only one response category to the open-ended question about subjects' descriptions of a nurturant father.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis assessed the relationship between fathers' early experience in child care and paternal nurturance. The independent variables in this analysis included the father's early child care experience prior to having had children of his own and the gender-type influence he received when growing up.

A content analysis was performed on the frequency of subjects' responses made to a question requesting fathers' ratings of the degree of masculine or feminine "daddy" role they were encouraged to follow as a child. Only 83% of fathers responded to the question. These fathers stated that they were encouraged to pursue a masculine to an androgynous gender role and no feminine traits were included in subjects' responses.

A content analysis was also computed on the responses made by fathers to an open-ended question regarding types of early experience interacting with children. Ninety-four percent of total fathers sampled responded to the
question and Table 10 shows the seven major categories of responses that resulted from the analysis. Fathers were again divided into high-nurturant and low-nurturant groups based on their PNI score.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Variable</th>
<th>Total Group (N=61)</th>
<th>High Nurturant Fathers (n=31)</th>
<th>Low Nurturant Fathers (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No prior interaction</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Little/occasional interaction</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Babysat/supervised/cared for siblings, friend's, relative's children</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involved in educating children (Sunday school, youth group, counseling)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Involved in sports/play-oriented activities with children</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Combination of #s 3 and 4 above</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Combination of #s 3 and 5 above</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third category (i.e., the father's previous experience in babysitting, supervising, and caring for siblings and other people's children) was the most frequent type of response made by all fathers sampled. Low-nurturant fathers were slightly less likely to have not had previous interaction with children compared to high-nurturant fathers (18.8% and 12.1%, respectively). On the other hand, high-nurturant fathers were more likely to have had little or occasional interaction than low-nurturant fathers (18.2% and 6.3%, respectively). Chi-square analyses revealed that high-nurturant fathers responded significantly differently from their counterparts on having had little previous interaction with children, $\chi^2(1, N = 8) = 6.18, p < .012$. Chi-square analyses also showed that high-nurturant fathers had been involved in a combination of caregiving and educational activities significantly more frequently than low-nurturant fathers, $\chi^2(1, N = 7) = 3.88, p < .046$. Similarly, high-nurturant fathers had been involved with children significantly more frequently in a caregiving and play-oriented context than low-nurturant fathers $\chi^2(1, N = 2) = 6.50, p < .011$.

In summary, these analyses showed that high-nurturant fathers had more frequent early experience in caregiving, educational, and play-oriented activities with children than low-nurturant fathers. The findings of these
analyses revealed marginal support for Hypothesis three.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis evaluated the relative contributions of fathers' sociocultural influences on paternal nurturance. The independent demographic variables were the father's age, occupation, education, income, spouse's occupation, and the number of children currently in the home. Also, the father's support network was assessed, including the quantity of support he received towards fathering, his satisfaction with the support, and an assessment of spousal support he received. Finally, the father's marriage and his (and his wife's) employment flexibility and satisfaction were assessed relative to father nurturance.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed on the father's support network, marital assessment, and the couple's employment relative to paternal nurturance. Two calculations were computed. The first included all variables. In the second, the demographic variables were partialled out to evaluate their influence on the relationships between father nurturance and the sociocultural variables. Table 11 shows the coefficients.
Table 11

Complete and Partial Pearson Correlation Coefficients For Father's Support Network, Marriage, and Couple's Employment with Paternal Nurturance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociocultural Variables</th>
<th>Complete Correlation</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Quantity</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Quality</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal Support</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Assessment</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Flexibility</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation revealed no significant associations between the sociocultural variables and father nurturance. Although nonsignificant, the father's age, occupation, and education do appear to clarify the relationship between the satisfaction of the father's support variables and father nurturance. By contrast, once controlled, the calculations indicated that these demographic variables appear to mask the strength of the relationships between spousal support, and marital assessment, with father nurturance.

A t-test was performed to see if there were differences among high and low-nururant father groups on
the father's support network, marital assessment, and the couple's employment. Table 12 shows that no significant differences were found.

Table 12

Mean Comparisons Between High-Nurturant and Low-Nurturant Father Groups on Support Network, Marital Assessment, and Couple's Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>High Nurturant Fathers (n=33) M</th>
<th>Low Nurturant Fathers (n=32) M</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Quantity</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>- .66</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Satisfaction</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal Support</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>- .57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Assessment</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>- .64</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Flexibility</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fathers were also asked to indicate the changes they would like to receive in the support they get in fathering. Responses were categorized into seven major themes. Table 13 reflects the distribution of responses for the total group and for high versus low-nurturant
fathers. Forty-eight percent of the total sample neglected to answer the question. High-nurturant fathers requested more spousal and practical support than they presently received, and stated more frequently than the low-nurturant group that they did not need any changes in the support they currently received.

Table 13

"Desired Changes in Support Received" By Total Fathers Sampled, High-Nurturant Fathers, and Low-Nurturant Fathers: Relative Percentage By Father Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total Group (N=34)</th>
<th>High Nurturant Fathers (n=20)</th>
<th>Low Nurturant Fathers (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change required</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More educational services/ support</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More economical means</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More moral support</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More spousal support</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More advice</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More practical support</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of chi-square analyses on this question showed that high-nurturant fathers requested more educational support, $\chi^2(1, N = 4) = 6.14$, $p < .013$. Twelve percent of this group of subjects requested more help in obtaining educational services and skills whereas only three percent of low-nurturant fathers requested more of this type of support. High-nurturant fathers also requested significantly more spousal support in fathering, $\chi^2(1, N = 6) = 15.00$, $p < .000$, than low-nurturant fathers. By contrast, low-nurturant fathers requested more moral support, $\chi^2(1, N = 3) = 4.14$, $p < .039$; and more practical support, $\chi^2(1, N = 1) = 20.58$, $p < .000$, in fathering than high-nurturant fathers did.

To summarize, although the correlation analyses were not statistically significant, the results did seem to show that the demographic variables had a slight effect on the relationships between father nurturance and the sociocultural variables. The t-test analyses revealed no significant differences among high and low-nurturant father groups. Lastly, the content and chi-square analyses indicated, overall, that almost half of the total sample of fathers failed to state what types of changes they wished to receive in their current support. Of those who did respond, low-nurturant fathers did so most frequently in stating that no changes were needed. High-nurturant fathers responded to the question
more frequently than their counterparts. Based on chi-square analyses, both groups of fathers wished to receive more support in different areas of life. High-nurturant fathers requested more educational information and spousal support whereas low-nurturant fathers wished for more moral and practical support.

Additional Analyses

To examine the patterns and strengths of the variables' relationships to one another, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed. Because of the large number of predictor variables in the calculation, Table 14 reflects only the coefficients with statistical significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable List</th>
<th>Significant Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. Nurturant Personality and:</td>
<td>#2, $r = .28$, $p &lt; .013$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3, $r = .33$, $p &lt; .003$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Playful Personality and:</td>
<td>#6, $r = .27$, $p &lt; .014$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#10, $r = .21$, $p &lt; .048$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. Fathering Perception and:</td>
<td>#5, $r = .23$, $p &lt; .032$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#6, $r = .26$, $p &lt; .018$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8, $r = .27$, $p &lt; .015$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#9, $r = .25$, $p &lt; .022$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. Child care Experience and:</td>
<td>#9, $r = -.20$, $p &lt; .053$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. Support Quality and:</td>
<td>#6, $r = .56$, $p &lt; .000$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6. Support Satisfaction and:</td>
<td>#7, $r = .40$, $p &lt; .001$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8, $r = .37$, $p &lt; .001$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7. Spousal Support and:</td>
<td>#8, $r = .76$, $p &lt; .000$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#14, $r = .23$, $p &lt; .034$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8. Marital Assessment and:</td>
<td>#13, $r = .21$, $p &lt; .050$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#14, $r = .23$, $p &lt; .032$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9. Job Satisfaction and:</td>
<td>#10, $r = .40$, $p &lt; .000$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#11, $r = -.26$, $p &lt; .019$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#20, $r = -.35$, $p &lt; .002$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10. Job Flexibility and:</td>
<td>#13, $r = -.21$, $p &lt; .046$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11. Nurturant Quality and:</td>
<td>#12, $r = -.60$, $p &lt; .000$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#13, $r = .27$, $p &lt; .014$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#14, $r = .71$, $p &lt; .000$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#17, $r = -.21$, $p &lt; .044$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12. Rejecting Quality and:</td>
<td>#13, $r = -.52$, $p &lt; .000$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#17, $r = .28$, $p &lt; .012$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#18, $r = -.34$, $p &lt; .002$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13. Limit-Setting Quality and:</td>
<td>#14, $r = .25$, $p &lt; .023$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty significant correlations between the independent variables resulted from this computation. Of these, five coefficients reflected very strong linear relationships ($r \geq + .50$). First, the quantity of the father's support network he received towards fathering was positively related with his satisfaction with such support, $r(N=65) = .56$, $p < .000$. Second, the support the father receives from his spouse was positively correlated with his assessment of his marriage, $r(N=65) = .76$, $p < .000$. Third, when subjects perceived their own fathers as having been nurturant towards them, a significant negative correlation was found with having had a father who had been rejecting towards them in childhood, $r(N=65) = -.60,$
Fourth, subjects who perceived their own fathers as having been nurturant tended to report having had a positive relationship with their own fathers as children, \( r(N=65) = .71, p< .000 \). Finally, fathers who had been raised by a rejecting father were not likely to have had limits set on their childhood behaviors by their fathers, \( r(N=65) = -.52, p< .000 \).

Hierarchical regression. A hierarchical regression analysis was utilized to determine if the father's age, education, and income would affect the predictive influence of the independent father variables to paternal nurturance.

The analysis involved entering the father's age, education, and income in stepwise fashion first, followed by all the remaining variables. Table 15 includes the steps, the variables, the Rs, the R²s, the F change ratios, and the probability values for each independent variable. The set of fathers' demographic variables entered into the regression equation did not significantly contribute to the prediction of paternal nurturance. However, the father's perception of fathering accounted for 43% of the variance in father nurturance. The father's quantity of the support he received towards fathering increased the explained variance to 56%. The father's personality dimension of playfulness determined
an aggregate 67% of the variance in father nurturance. Only these three variables achieved the cut-off F test criteria (p < .05) for inclusion in the analysis. It appears that the father's age, education, and income do not significantly affect the robustness of these predictor variables.

Table 15
Hierarchical Regression of Father's Variables on Paternal Nurturance, Father's Demographics Entered First Followed By All Remaining Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Perception</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Support</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Playfulness</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize, the correlation computations revealed numerous significant relationships among the predictor variables. In the sociocultural category, those with the strongest associations to one another were the three facets of the father's support network (i.e., quantity and satisfaction with support and spousal support) and the subjects' marital assessment. With respect to the subject's recollection of his early paternal relationship,
the Nurturant, Positive, and Rejecting qualities of the relationship were strongly interrelated.

The regression analysis showed that the father's perception of fathering, the quantity of the support he receives in fathering, and his playful demeanor best predict his capacity to be nurturant to his children. It is important to note the large number of predictor variables and the small sample size in this study when assessing the statistical validity of the regression model. Although small samples tend to lower the power of statistical tests and increase the probability of Type II error, the results that were obtained from this sample--based on the given significance level--may be as important theoretically and practically as results that are obtained from a large number of subjects.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

Overview
The present study found that the father's perception of himself as a parent, the degree of importance that he attributes to his role as a father, and the personal rewards and satisfaction he derives from the experience of fathering have the most predictive value in influencing the extent to which he is nurturant towards his own children. Second, the amount of support he receives from various educational, informational, moral, spousal, and service-oriented sources also has an important bearing on his nurturant capacity. Finally, a father's involvement in play-oriented activities is influential in determining how nurturant he is likely to be with his children. The experience of being involved with children may also influence his engagement in playful behaviors. The specific findings of this study are discussed in more detail below.

Hypothesis 1. It was postulated that a father's capacity to be nurturant to his own children would be significantly influenced by the quality of his relationship with his own father. Contrary to findings of other studies (e.g., Lamb, 1976), little evidence from the current study supported this hypothesis.
This study found that fathers who had experienced a rejecting relationship with their own fathers in childhood also described their fathers as being nonnurturant. Sixteen percent of low-nurturant fathers, in contrast to only three percent of high-nurturant fathers, stated in their responses to the question on their experience being a father that they wanted to compensate for the lack of warmth and attention they had received by being more available and attentive to their own children. Although these fathers said that they did not choose to follow suit with the type of fathering they had received in childhood, the majority of these fathers (i.e., low-nurturant fathers) scored low on nurturance. Although some fathers (i.e., those who had non-nurturant fathers) had stated that they wished to be more involved with their children than their fathers had been with them, these fathers did not actually do so. It may be that the effects of social desirability on fathers to respond according to the society's acceptable expectations influenced these results. It is also possible that these fathers did not know how to be nurturant because they did not have a nurturant model to imitate. Previous studies (e.g., Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Belsky & Isabella, 1985; DeFrain, 1979; Eiduson & Alexander, 1978) have described such a "compensatory" model of male nurturance which the current study has confirmed to be an important characteristic of
the father's incentive to be nurturant.

Subjects from the current total group who had experienced a nurturant, accepting, and loving relationship with their own fathers also remembered their fathers as being less rejecting, as having set reasonable expectations and limits on their behavior, and as having genuinely enjoyed interacting with them as children.

Overall, the study found that a father's capacity to nurture is not closely related to the type of father model he received as a youth. However, fathers who remembered their own fathers as being nonnurturant also appeared to have a decisive attitude to make up for this lack of nurturance with their current father-child relationship.

Although previous research has found that "compensatory" and "imitative" models of father nurturance exist, the father's motivation to nurture does not appear to be significantly influenced by the level of nurturance he had received as a child. Perhaps these current subjects did not attribute much value to the quality of their early paternal relationship as it effects their personal aspirations in fathering. Based on a host of factors which antedate a father's potential to be nurturant, it is possible that fathers learn how to be nurturant toward their children through other means not directly measured in this study. It may also be that a
father's ability to choose the type of parental role he wishes to perform takes precedence over the modeling effects he learned from his own father. This also suggests that a child's exposure to a nurturant or nonnurturant role-model may not necessarily impede his decision or potential to nurture as an adult.

Hypothesis 2. The relative contributions of the father's personality attributes (i.e., nurturance, playfulness, perception of fathering) to his capacity to be nurturant were examined. The results showed that the rewards and values the father attributed to the fathering experience, and the play-oriented component of his personality are significantly related to his current level of adult nurturance.

According to Aldous' (1974) "role-maker" theory, fathers may be more likely to adopt and perform confidently in a shared-caregiver role if they possess high levels of self-esteem, sensitivity, flexibility, and a secure locus of control. In the current study, a father's nurturant and playful personality characteristics were strongly related to having a positive outlook on fathering. Thus, a father with such personality traits may be more likely to welcome and assume a nonnormative paternal role which includes a high level of father-child involvement.

Unexpectedly, however, high-nurturant fathers in the
present study attributed less positive values to the experience of fathering than low-nurturant fathers. These fathers may have been highly involved with their children due to factors that they had limited control over (i.e., mother's employment, financial restrictions). Therefore, it is still uncertain if it is the changes in the father's role that influence his attitudes towards fathering, or if it is the rejection of traditional attitudes that leads a father to assume a shared-caregiving lifestyle (Russell, 1986).

Like the findings of Levy-Shiff and Israelashvili's (1988) study (i.e., fathers who viewed fathering as a self-enriching experience were also likely to consider themselves as affiliative, nurturant, and sociable people), high-nurturant fathers in the current study also perceived themselves as having nurturant and playful personality characteristics. They were also likely to perceive their fathering role to be positive, fulfilling, and meaningful.

In the present study, it was found that fathers who were play-oriented also seem more inclined to adopt a nurturant parental role. Perhaps fathers who engage in activities for the purpose of amusement are also likely to be magnetized by the type of behaviors that so often captivate children's interests. Playfulness frequently characterizes the quality of the father-child
relationship. Children are also often attracted to adults who are responsive toward them and who seem to enjoy being around them. Therefore, it may be that fathers who inherently have a playful character may be likely to partake in child-oriented activities and find them gratifying. As it may be inferred that playfulness breeds nurturance, the experience of being nurturant towards children may also influence a father's involvement in play-oriented behaviors.

Similar to Radin and Sagi's (1982) finding that shared-caregiving parents place more value on interpersonal sensitivity, expressiveness, and independence, the present study found that a father's capacity to be nurturant and involved with his children is strongly linked to the nurturant component of his personality. High-nurturant fathers also described a nurturant father by his availability to the child for the purpose of encouraging the child's independent mediation of his or her own world.

Russell (1983) found that nontraditional fathers opted for a shared-caregiving lifestyle because they were committed to sharing the responsibility of raising their children. Russell and Radin (1985) also found that nontraditional fathers rejected the belief that women were fundamentally better suited for parenting. Congruent with these findings, the current study found that high-
nurturant fathers more frequently ascribed, in their descriptions of a nurturant father, parental capabilities which include meeting the needs of the child in all domains of life.

In summary, the results of this study show that the rewards gained from and the degree of importance attributed to the experience of fathering, and the father's playfulness are related to how nurturant he may be toward his children. Consonant with previous research, it is likely that fathers in this study are involved with their children due to their nontraditional aspirations of themselves as parents, and their desire to instill egalitarian and self-efficacy principles in their children.

**Hypothesis 3.** The father's early experience in child care was examined relative to his capacity to be nurturant. Soule, Standley, and Copans (1979) advocated that frequent early contact with children could be advantageous for future fathering. Russell (1983) also emphasized that fathers who are more willing to adopt a caregiving role will be more knowledgeable, more competent in child care, and will have had more experience with children. Although the current study showed that high-nurturant fathers had more early exposure to children, (e.g., involvement in child care, sports, and educational activities) than low-nurturant fathers, the lack of a
significant relationship between having had early experience and the father's current level of nurturance may in part be related to the idea that past experience caring for children may not be qualitatively the same kind of experience as that of caring for one's own children. Previous experience may facilitate caregiving skills, but the lack of such experience, as exemplified by this study, may not necessarily impede a father's capacity to be nurturant. The father's involvement in caring for his children may be sufficient enough for fathers to develop and refine their skills, as well as to improve their self-confidence in being a parent and enhance their capacity to be nurturant.

Hypothesis 4. The relative contribution of the father's socioeconomic status, support network, marital assessment, and the couple's employment on the father's level of nurturance were assessed.

The relationship between social class and father nurturance has been examined in previous research. Studies have found that new lifestyles originate among the highly educated and professional social groups (e.g., Hollingshead, 1968; Kohn, 1967; Rosen, 1967). Others have found that fathers' occupational status and level of nurturance differed widely (Russell, 1982). In the current study, 91% of the subjects had acquired some or completed their college education. Furthermore, consonant
with Russell's (1982) study of families who had chosen to adopt nontraditional parental roles, mothers (and fathers) tended to have semiprofessional occupations in the current study. One can speculate that nurturant fathers may seek out a variety of different occupations which they find satisfying and rewarding, and marry spouses who have similar occupational and vocational aspirations for themselves. Thus, since the subjects who volunteered to participate in this study were principally from an educated, higher socioeconomic class, the generalizability of the results can only be inferred to other fathers who are similar socioeconomically.

Previous research (e.g., Russell, 1983) has found that the quality of the father's support network is an important determinant of his capacity to be nurturant. The current study found that social approval and encouragement from wives, friends, and other significant others are important factors in increasing and maintaining father nurturance. Previous studies (e.g., Barnett & Baruch, 1984; McHale & Huston, 1984; Russell, 1986) have found that the mother's endorsement of egalitarian roles in parenting and her support of her husband's involvement in child care are important influences of the father's nurturance.

However, in general, the current study found that high-nurturant fathers (more often than low-nurturant
fathers) reported that they did not receive the support they needed from their wives for this role. This may be related to finding of studies by Pleck (1982) and Lamb et al. (1987) who noted that many mothers do not want increased participation from their husbands. Perhaps mother's who become frustrated with their husband's lack of experience in child care lessen their interest in their husband's parental participation which in turn may lead high-nurturant fathers to request their wives' increased encouragement and support in their parental involvement.

Unlike previous studies (e.g., Cowan & Cowan, 1985; Levy-Shiff & Israeliashvili, 1988), the current study did not find that the father's marital relationship was influential in determining nurturance. Based on the results, the influence of the marital relationship did not appear to exceed the influence of the father's self-perceptions on his capacity to be nurturant. This may reflect an inherent tendency of nurturant fathers to rely on their own inner volition and inclinations rather than on the external influences of his marital and social relationships to determine how nurturant they will be with their children.

However, similar to Yogman (1983), the quality of the father's marriage in the current study was related to his satisfaction with the support he received in parenting as well as the amount of spousal support he received.
Unlike previous research (e.g., Russell, 1981; Russell & Radin, 1983), this study did not find that the couple's employment status and flexibility had predictive influences on the quantity and quality of the father-child relationship. Again, it would seem that the father's perception of his role as a parent is most significant here. The external influence of the couple's job arrangements did not appear to make a substantial difference in the way the fathers nurtured their children in this study. In other words, the father's attitude towards his function as a father and his capacity to be nurturant may not be affected by the way his employment arrangements are regulated.

In summary, the quality of support that a father receives in parenting appears to be a significant predictor of his capacity to nurture, even though high-nurturant fathers do not appear to receive as much spousal support as they would like to have. Also, although the father's marital relationship, and the couple's satisfaction with and flexibility of employment are important denominators of a father's nurturant capacity in the literature, they do not independently antedate his propensity to nurture in this study.

Additional findings. Eleven subjects completed a response sheet with their personal comments about the questionnaire. The scope of respondent's reactions ranged
from positive to negative remarks. Six themes of responses were delineated from the father's statements: 1) three fathers stated they were pleased to help out and were interested in the research, 2) two fathers stated that the questionnaire was a terrific and noteworthy survey, 3) three fathers stated that they often think about their role as fathers and the survey encouraged some more soul-searching, 4) three fathers expressed some confusion when answering the questions since the questionnaire did not measure the role of stepfathers with second families, and 5) two fathers stated that the questionnaire was ambiguous and shortsighted with its intent to reveal the truths about the role of the father.

Of the thirty-one response sheets returned, only four fathers shared their genuine interest in the findings of the research. One might wonder if perhaps society's general lack of interest and understanding of the role of the father inhibits fathers (and others) from being interested in or responding to studies of fatherhood.

**Critique of Methodology**

**Sample size and reliability.** Locating a sufficient number of fathers to participate has been shown by present and previous research to pose a hardship. The choice to evaluate the results using significance levels of < .05 was primarily for descriptive purposes since an insufficient number of effects would have resulted if only
tests achieving a < .001 criterion had been utilized in the final analyses. It was deemed important to retain these effects for the use of future research.

Sample selection. The method of sample selection for this study, i.e., the voluntary participation of the subjects, limits the generalizability of these findings. Fathers who volunteered to participate in the study may differ from subjects who were not asked to participate. A priori, volunteer participants may be more interested in contributing to scientific research, may be more conscientious in their performance as fathers, and may be more likely to respond in a manner that seeks to satisfy the purposes of the study than subjects whose behaviors are unwillingly and unknowingly reported. Thus, the possibility of drawing invalid conclusions because of selection bias may be a limiting factor in the present study.

The "demand" characteristics of each setting in which fathers were recruited may also have had varying effects on fathers' motivations to participate in the study. For example, fathers who were approached personally at a Father's Day dinner for participation in this study may have differed from those fathers who had been asked to participate at the parenting classes that were visited --especially if the fathers had been court-ordered to attend the classes. Since contact between experimenter
and subjects has a social component that may influence the
disposition, speed, or accuracy of subjects' responses,
subjects who had not been personally approached by the
experimenter may not have felt pressured to comply like
those fathers who had agreed to participate at the dinner.

Future studies should limit the selection of subjects
to fathers of first-time families. Although only five
fathers of stepfamilies mentioned that part four of Part
VI of the Paternal Nurturance Index was difficult to
answer since the questions in this section were designed
for fathers in first-time families only, other fathers who
did not respond may have also had stepfamilies, thus
further limiting the generalizability of the results to
the population of first-time fathers.

Also, fathers who had a child old enough to care for
his or her own feeding, bathing, and dressing needs had
difficulty accurately answering these questions. Limiting
the age criteria of father's children to 0 to 8 years of
age rather than 0 to 12 years may diminish this problem.

Subject's comments vs. Likert-scale assessments.
When fathers were asked to comment on their "experience
being a father," high-nurturant fathers stated (in a
significantly different manner compared to low-nurturant
fathers) that they considered fathering to be very
rewarding and they could not compare the experience to
anything else in their lives to be as important. However,
when these same fathers responded to the perception of fathering measure, their outlook on fathering was less favorable than low-nurturant fathers. Fathers commented on the first measure in open-ended question format whereas the latter measure utilized a Likert scale. Fathers may have been less likely to respond truthfully to open-ended questions based on the desire to answer the question in the most socially acceptable manner. Subjects may have responded to the question by giving answers which fathers would ascribe to be "right" or appropriate, and best satisfy the purpose of the study.

Retrospective data. This study used subjects' retrospective responses to test the hypothesis assessing the predictive influence of the father's early paternal relationship in determining his current level of parental nurturance. Unfortunately, retrospective accounts may be dubious in nature. The accuracy of an individual's recollection of past events is questionable in such situations. A method to circumvent this problem in future research may be to devise a measure which would assess the responses of both the subjects and the subjects' fathers regarding their early relationships with each other, and to then determine the validity of the measure based on the correlations between the two sets of responses.

Questionnaire format. Due to the length of the questionnaire and the introspective effort required of the
subjects, the effects of fatigue and the placement of the open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire may have lessened the response rate to these items. In future studies, embedding these questions earlier in the questionnaire (and shortening the questionnaire overall) may increase the rate of answered questionnaires.

Summary and Conclusions

It cannot be inferred from the results of this study which factors in a father's past or present life experience cause him to be a nurturant parent. However, the findings do show that the way a father perceives his role and function as a father is fundamentally related to the way he nurtures his own children. The nature of the support he receives in this role was also found to be vital in influencing his ability to nurture as a parent. The degree of playfulness he engages in was found to be strongly related to the quality of his relationship with his children.

It has been shown in other studies that fathers who are highly nurturant value independence in themselves and promote similar behaviors in their children (e.g., DeFrain, 1979; Radin & Sagi, 1982). Regardless of the father's past influences, fathers who have a strong sense of themselves and are secure in their role as a parent are more likely to nurture their children. Fathers who see themselves as competent in a nontraditional parental
role presumably may also strengthen their children's self-perceptions in problem-solving situations and achievement.

The value of the father to his child has become increasingly important. With the influx of dual-career families, he may no longer simply be the breadwinner, disciplinarian, or distant authority figure. Shared-parenting has become more commonplace in the home, although the decision to share the child care may result from economic necessity rather than choice. As a result, he may have more frequent and meaningful contact with his children.

Research has shown that the nurturance a father imparts to his children is unique unto itself. It cannot be replicated by the mother nor can its effects on the child be denied. Children thrive developmentally when they have been fortunate enough to have been raised by an emotionally available father.

Based on the current study, the rewards a father derives from and the values he attributes to the experience of fathering most strongly predict how nurturant he will be with his children. Therefore, in the social forum, it would benefit the development of children to encourage the involvement of fathers with their children. Promoting a positive outlook of their function as nurturant parents and supporting fathers' interest and efforts in their parental role is important for fathers to
excel in this new endeavor.

The results of this study have shown that the quantity of support a father receives is also significantly related to his function as a nurturant parent. Improved sources of information, services, and support would be essential in fostering the development of fathers' nurturance as well as further serving the needs of the growing child.

Overall, the results of this study suggest which factors in a father's life influence the degree of nurturance he expresses towards his own children. Previous research has established that fathers play an essential role in children's development. The current study further promotes this very important function. Its value is also evinced by the personal rewards the father receives from his experience being a nurturant parent.

This study has gleaned that regardless of the father's background experiences, his perception of himself should be influenced and encouraged to follow a nurturant path. In so doing, the chances his child will be raised by a loving, confident, and competent father may be greatly increased.
Recruitment Form For Lovett's Children's Center

DADS ONLY!

Have you noticed how being a Dad has changed since you were growing up with your own father? The father's role is becoming increasingly important for the growing child but studies on dads are scarce. Would you be willing to complete a questionnaire on FATHERING for a graduate student/parent at Lovett's that you fill out at home from California State University, San Bernardino?

We need the participation of employed fathers, between 19 and 50 years old who have employed wives (full or part-time), and a child between 6 months to 12 years-old to fill out a 30-minute survey about your experiences as a DAD.

If you would like to participate, please fill out the lower portion of this flyer and return it to your child's teacher within a week. A questionnaire will be sent home to you within two weeks.

Questions? Contact Monique Wilson (M.A. Candidate) at (714) 787-6789 or Dr. Laura Kamptner at (714) 880-5582.

Your participation is deeply appreciated!

[ ] Yes, I want to participate in the Fathering Study. Please send me a questionnaire.

Father's Name ________________________________
Child's Name _________________________________
Address __________________ City _______ Zip____
Teacher's Name______________________________Room # _____
APPENDIX B

Recruitment Form For All Other Children's Facilities

DADS ONLY!

Have you noticed how being a Dad has changed since you were growing up with your own father? The father's role is becoming increasingly important for the growing child but studies on dads are scarce. Would you be willing to complete a questionnaire on FATHERING that you fill out at home from California State University, San Bernardino?

We need the participation of employed fathers, between 19 and 50 years old who have employed wives (full or part-time), and a child between 6 months to 12 years-old to fill out a mailed, 30-minute survey about your experience as a DAD.

If you would like to participate, please fill out the lower portion of this flyer and return it to your child's teacher, or return it directly to Monique Wilson (M.A. Candidate), Department of Psychology, CSUSB, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, Ca 92407. A questionnaire will be mailed to you within two weeks.

Questions? Contact Monique Wilson at (714) 787-6789 or Dr. Laura Kamptner at (714) 880-5582.

Your participation is deeply appreciated!

[ ] Yes, I want to participate in the Fathering Study. Please send me a questionnaire.

Father's Name ____________________________________________

Address ________________________________________________

City ___________________________ Zip____________
Dear "DAD",

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. The purpose of this study is to examine how fathers relate to their children, how they see themselves as fathers, and how important they feel fathering is to them. Fathers are becoming more and more important to their children, yet our understanding of the father's role is still in need of more research.

Therefore, this is where you can play a direct part in increasing our knowledge in this area. By sharing your experience as a father in this questionnaire, we hope to better understand what factors in a father's life are most important to his parenting success. Please feel free to include any comments and suggestions regarding this questionnaire on the last page, and if you would like some information on the results of this study, please include your name and address so that we may send you a copy.

Again, thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,

Monique R. I. Wilson, M.A. Candidate
Dr. N. Laura Kamptner, Ph. D.
Department of Psychology
APPENDIX D

A Questionnaire For Dads

PART I: Background Information

1) Your Age: _____  2) Your Occupation: ________________

3) Your Ethnic background: _____Asian _____Caucasian
   _____Black _____Hispanic
   _____Other (______________)

4) Highest level of education completed:
   Some grade school _____ Some college_____
   Completed grade school _____ Completed college _____
   Some high school _____ Some graduate work _____
   Completed high school _____ Completed doctorate_____

5) Your current total family annual income:
   15,000 or lower _____
   15,001 - 45,000 _____
   45,001 - higher_____  

6) Number of children you have: _____

7) Age(s) and sex (indicate M or F) of your children from
   the oldest to the youngest:
   1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
   4. _____ 5. _____ 6. _____

8) If your parents were separated/divorced or widowed,
   how old were you when this occurred?
   ________________________________

Part II. To what extent do the following describe the
way you see yourself? Please circle one
number for each of the questions below.

          Strongly          Strongly
          agree            disagree
1) I don't waste my time on foolish games of skill. 1 2 3 4 5

2) I think helping others is a waste of time 1 2 3 4 5

3) I like to be entertained. 1 2 3 4 5

4) Showing people I am interested in their troubles is very important to me. 1 2 3 4 5

5) I don't really enjoy going out in the evening. 1 2 3 4 5

6) I think children are a nuisance because they require so much care. 1 2 3 4 5

7) I often do something for no reason at all except that it sounds like it might be fun. 1 2 3 4 5

8) If someone is lonely, I spend some time trying to cheer them up. 1 2 3 4 5

9) I rarely waste my time merely amusing myself. 1 2 3 4 5

10) I don't like it when friends ask to borrow my possessions. 1 2 3 4 5

11) At times I get fascinated by some unimportant game and play it for hours. 1 2 3 4 5

12) I find satisfaction in giving sympathy to someone who is ill. 1 2 3 4 5

13) I very seldom take the time to go to parties. 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To me, it seems foolish to try to solve another fellow's problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I think it's enjoyable to have a big celebration even for small events.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I would be an incomplete human being if I did not make every effort to help my fellow man.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I never play jokes on people, and prefer not to have jokes played on me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>One of my greatest incentives to work is to have a good time when I'm through.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I think giving sympathy to people does them more harm than good.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I watch the news reports on television more often than the comedy programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I like pictures of babies because they are always so cute.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rarely, if ever, do I turn down a chance to have a good time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I avoid doing too many favors for people because it would seem as if I were trying to buy friendship.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I prefer to be with people who are relatively serious.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Babysitting is a rewarding job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I try to make my work into a game.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have never done volunteer work for charity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Even if I had the money and the time, I wouldn't feel right just playing around.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I often take young people &quot;under my wing.&quot;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I enjoy children's games.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I feel no responsibility for the troubles of other people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I believe in working toward the future rather than spending my time in fun now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I would rather have a job serving people than a job making something.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I joke and talk rather than work whenever possible.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Caring for plants is a bother.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Many things are more important to me than having a good time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I would enjoy spending a lot of time taking care of pets.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38)</td>
<td>If I could, I would hire a professional nurse to care for a sick child rather than do it myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39)</td>
<td>I pride myself on being able to see the funny side of every situation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40)</td>
<td>Sometimes when a friend is in trouble, I am unable to sleep because I want so much to help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part III.** For the following questions, please mark the rating that indicates to what extent each item applied to your father during the years when you were a child growing up. Please check the one you are rating:

( ) Biological father
( ) Stepfather
( ) Other father figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liked to talk to me and be with me much of the time.</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Very Seldom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyed doing things with me.</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Very Seldom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyed working with me in the house or yard.</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Very Seldom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Very Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was happy to see me when I came home from school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a good time at home with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw to it that I knew exactly what I might or might not do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made me feel I was not loved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed in showing his love for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had certain jobs to do, he did not allow me to do anything else until the jobs were done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought my ideas were silly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood my problems and worries and helped with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed in correcting and improving my behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wished he hadn't had any children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Very Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugged or kissed me good night when I was small.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw to it that I was on time coming home from school or for meals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got cross and angry about little things I did.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to make me feel better when I was upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insisted that I must do exactly as I was told.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said I was a big problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave me a lot of care and attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IV:
Step 1. Below are five descriptions of different types of support that you may or may not receive in being a father. Please read over these sources of support before answering the following questions. When answering the questions, consider how these sources of support help you in your role as a father.

**Moral Support:** Words of encouragement, sympathy or acceptance that make you feel good as a parent.
Advice and Information: Information about babysitters, schools; advice about how to treat your child.

Material Support: Money or gifts for clothing, special classes, medical bills, vacations, or toys.

Practical Service: Services which help you in carrying out your parenting activities. Example: babysitting, carpooling, housekeeping.

Educational Service: Formal activities to develop specific skills or general educational outcomes for your children. Example: Swimming classes; soft-ball classes; tutoring, etc.

1. For each type of support listed, how much support do you get from each of these sources? Circle the number that best describes how much you receive of each support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/Information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. For each type of support listed, mark how satisfied you are with the support you receive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/Information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How much stress do you typically experience from the combination of work and family responsibilities (Please circle one).

No stress 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  extreme stress

4. If possible, what kind of change would you like to see in the support you receive?

Step 2. How much help and/or moral support do you typically receive from your spouse in the following areas? (Please circle one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sharing child care responsibilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sharing household maintenance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supporting your work/professional activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Maintaining the marital relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part V:

1. Circle the star on the scale below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy or happiness in marriage.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Unhappy Happy Perfectly Happy
2. State the extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your spouse on the following items by circling the number that best reflects your feelings in each column:

a. Handling family finances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Matters of recreation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Demonstrations of affection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Friends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Sex Relations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. Conventionality (right, good, or proper conduct):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Agree</th>
<th>Frequently Agree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Philosophy of life:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Agree</th>
<th>Frequently Agree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h. Ways of dealing with in-laws:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Agree</th>
<th>Frequently Agree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the appropriate answer to each of the following questions:

3. When disagreements arise, they usually result in:
   (a) you giving in
   (b) wife giving in
   (c) agreement by mutual give and take

4. Do you and your spouse engage in outside interests together?
   (a) all of them
   (b) some of them
   (c) very few of them
   (d) none of them

5. In leisure time do you generally prefer to
   (a) be on the go
   (b) stay at home

   Does your spouse generally prefer to
   (a) be on the go
   (b) stay at home
6. Do you ever wish you had not married?
   (a) Frequently
   (b) Occasionally
   (c) Rarely
   (d) never

7. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would
   (a) marry the same person
   (b) marry a different person
   (c) not marry at all

8. Do you confide in your mate
   (a) almost never
   (b) rarely
   (c) in most things
   (d) in everything

Part VI:

1. How flexible is your spouse's job when family needs require her to reschedule her work hours?

   Not at all flexible
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. How satisfied would you say you are with the flexibility of your spouse's paid work schedule?
   Which number comes closest to how you feel—7 represents completely satisfied and 1 represents not at all satisfied?

   Not at all satisfied
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. All things considered, how satisfied would you say you are with your own paid work schedule?

   Not at all satisfied
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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4. How flexible is your job when you need to take time off or reschedule your work day to meet your needs or those of your family? Which number comes closest to how you feel—7 represents very flexible and 1 represents not at all flexible?

Not at all flexible          Very flexible
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. How satisfied would you say you are with the flexibility of your work? Which number comes closest to how you feel—7 represents completely satisfied and 1 represents not at all satisfied.

Not at all satisfied          Completely satisfied
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6. What is your spouse's occupation?

__________________________________________________________

Part VII:

1. Please check how involved you are in caring for your children:

   a. very involved _____
   b. involved _____
   c. neutral _____
   d. uninvolved _____
   e. very uninvolved _____

2. Not counting the hours your child is in school or in a child care center, with a sitter, or asleep for the night, what percentage of the remaining time are you the child's prime caregiver? _____%. What percentage is your spouse the prime caregiver? _____%. (The prime caregiver is the person who must be available to attend to the child's needs).

3. Who in your family generally makes decisions about the following and how frequently?
a. The choice of daycare, preschool, or elementary school facility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Hus. more</th>
<th>Hus. &amp; Wife</th>
<th>Wife more</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always than wife</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equally than hus. always</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. When children are old enough to try new things:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Hus. more</th>
<th>Hus. &amp; Wife</th>
<th>Wife more</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always than wife</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equally than hus. always</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. This section is composed of two parts:

1. Please mark how frequently the following parenting tasks are done in your family in the three left-hand side columns below:

   1. Feeding the child:
      - Frequently
      - Sometimes
      - Infrequently
      - Self
      - Spouse
      - Other

   2. Having sole responsibility for the child:
      - Frequently
      - Sometimes
      - Infrequently
      - Self
      - Spouse
      - Other

   3. Disciplining the child:
      - Frequently
      - Sometimes
      - Infrequently
      - Self
      - Spouse
      - Other

   4. Setting limits for children's behavior:
      - Frequently
      - Sometimes
      - Infrequently
      - Self
      - Spouse
      - Other
5. Helping children with personal problems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Bathing and dressing the children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Putting the children to bed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Helping the children to learn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please mark how available you are to your children in the appropriate columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>away from home and children weeks and months at a time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>away from home days at a time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>away from home on weekends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>out in the evening at least 4 times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>out in the evening at least 2 times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>misses supper with children at least 2 nights a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. has breakfast
during the week
with children
and family

h. home during the
week for lunch

i. home afternoons
when children
come home from
school

j. home all day
during the week
with children
and family

Part VIII:

1. During your childhood, how often did you play with
toys that allowed you to be the "daddy?" For example, how
frequently did you get to play with dolls or playmates
that enabled you to have a fathering role? Please circle
to appropriate number.

Very frequently   Frequently   Sometimes   Rarely   Never
1                2               3             4          5

2. When you were growing up, how frequently did you
babysit your brothers and sisters or other children?

Very frequently   Frequently   Sometimes   Rarely   Never
1                2               3             4          5

3. How often were you encouraged by your parent(s) to
take care of other children or to play with toys or
playmates with which you were the "daddy?"

Very frequently   Frequently   Sometimes   Rarely   Never
1                2               3             4          5

4. Who encouraged you the most as a child to play the
"daddy" role?

a. Mother
b. Father
c. Other    Explain: ________________________
5. What kind of "daddy" would you say your parents encouraged you to be while growing up?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very masculine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Little of both</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Very feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In your own words, please describe your experiences interacting with children up until the birth of your own children. For example, did you participate in "Big Brother" activities, YMCA, Boy Scout leadership, took care of friends' or relatives' children, etc.

Part IX:

1. Please read the following question and circle the number which best describes how you feel about being a father:

"To me, being a father is....................."

a. Fulfilling  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Disappointing

b. Meaningful  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Meaningless

c. Exciting  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Dull

d. Natural  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Artificial

e. Easy  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Difficult

f. Rewarding  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Rip off

g. Freedom  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Restriction
Part X:

1. In your own words, describe your experience being a father. Include your thoughts about any difficulties, choices, rewards, and feelings you have encountered in your experience.

2. In your own words, how would you describe a "nurturant" father?
APPENDIX E

Thank You Note For Fathers Of Children In Centers

Thank you very much for your participation in this study! Your help in completing this study is most appreciated.

Please return your questionnaire to your child's teacher once you have completed it within two weeks from receipt.

If you would like a copy of this study's results (which we anticipate to have available in June 1990), fill in your name and address below, and return this form with this questionnaire:

Name ________________________________
Street _______________________________
City _______ Zip ________________

*******************************************************
*Optional: Do you have any personal responses to this questionnaire regarding its effects on you? You may comment below:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank You,

Monique R. I. Wilson, M.A. Candidate
Dr. Laura Kamptner, Ph. D.
Psychology Department
California State University,
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397
APPENDIX F

Thank You Note For Return Mail Questionnaires

Thank you very much for your participation in this study! Your help in completing this study is most appreciated.

Please return your completed questionnaire by mailing it in the enclosed postage paid manila envelope within two weeks from receipt.

If you would like a copy of this study's results (which we anticipate to have available in June 1990), fill in your name and address below, and return this form with this questionnaire:

Name _____________________________________________
Street _____________________________________________
City ___________ Zip ________________

*********************************************************************************************************************************
*Optional: Do you have any personal responses to this questionnaire regarding its effects on you? You may comment below:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank You,

Monique R. I. Wilson, M.A. Candidate
Dr. Laura Kamptner, Ph. D.
Psychology Department
California State University,
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397
APPENDIX G

Thank You Note For Fathers In Parenting Classes

Thank you very much for your participation in this study! Your help in completing this study is most appreciated.

Please return your completed questionnaire to your instructor within two weeks from receipt.

If you would like a copy of this study's results (which we anticipate to have available in June 1990), fill in your name and address below, and return this form with this questionnaire:

Name
Street
City Zip

*Optional: Do you have any personal responses to this questionnaire regarding its effects on you? You may comment below:


Thank You,

Monique R. I. Wilson, M.A. Candidate
Dr. Laura Kamptner, Ph. D.
Psychology Department
California State University,
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397
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